THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVII AUGUST, 1928 No. 98

EDITORIAL

We are not sorry to have been on the other side of the Atlantic during the climax of the Prayer Book controversy; all the more as we were able to learn at first hand something of the much happier methods by which the Church in America proceeds in such matters. We shall hope to write at greater length on this subject shortly. Meanwhile we cannot refrain from expressing the conviction that the true policy for all who love the English Church is to keep the situation as malleable and as free from party issues as possible. It seems certain that what lies before us is a period of authorized experiment; and it is essential that such experiment should be able to be judged on its merits, and not by reference to this or that party grouping. The dominating fact of the situation is not the conflict of opinions and customs within the Church of England, but the widespread indifference to all forms of religious observance and discipline which at present characterizes society. Such an occasion calls for a generous trustfulness between bishops and clergy, and between clergy and laity, and a wide tòleration of diversity in pastoral method. *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in omnibus caritas*: in such a spirit the Church can gather to its worship and go forward to its work without dismay. The appearance of the new one-volume Bible Commentary, which the S.P.C.K. is shortly to publish, will follow opportunely upon the rejection of the Prayer Book. For it will recall us to the great verities of the Catholic religion, and help us to plant our feet again securely upon the high-road of the Faith.

CLASSICAL ALLUSIONS IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

THE Pastorals bear the impress of authority. They are from one who exacts obedience and requires his representative to do the same—a proof that order and system are being introduced. Things are not yet straightened out. There is, however, more confusion in the Greek than in the Latin, a fact that shows that the writer had some acquaintance with Latin, as, indeed, is evident from the general idiom and style of the letters. Such letters might well have come from the hand or dictation of the apostle after his two years' conversation with Roman Prætorians, who had to be of pure Italian blood, and would abhor Greek in every form, and with other Latin-speaking persons. In 1 Tim. v. 1, "presbyter" is clearly used of a "senior" in age, as it is followed by "elder women (*πρεσβυτέρας*) as mothers." Deacon, *διάκονος*, in 1 Tim. iv. 6 is used in a more general sense than in 1 Tim. iii. 8, being applied to Timothy, "You will be a good *servant* of J. C.," where it is equivalent to "slave (*δοῦλος*) of the Lord" also used of Timothy in 2 Tim. ii. 24. In 2 Tim. ii. 15 Timothy is urged to show himself a "proved workman"—"workman," *ἐργάτης*, in 1 Tim. v. 18 referring to presbyters, and "proved," *δόκιμος*, to deacons in 1 Tim. iii. 10.* The Latin, however, is free from this confusion, having "senior" in 1 Tim. v. 1, "diaconi" in 1 Tim. iii. 8, but "minister" in 1 Tim. iv. 6. Similarly, the writer in his relation to God is a "slave" *δοῦλος*, but in his relation to those under him he is an "apostle" of Jesus Christ, issuing orders and plans of campaign like a commander. With regard to the appointment of presbyters in Tit. i. 5, he says: "according to the plans I laid down for you" (*διεταξάμην*). We have the same note of authority in 1 Cor. xi. 34 where, writing to one of his own Churches, he said: "The rest I shall arrange (*διατάξομαι*) on arrival." But here he is writing to a member of his staff. And the word is technically employed of such orders. Polybius used it of the orders of Lycurgus to his generals,† of Hannibal's orders to his officer,‡ of Scipio's military and civil arrangements in Spain,§ and of King Philip's dispositions.‖ Again, "order," *ἐπιταγή*, a Pauline word generally in the phrase *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν*

* *δοκιμαζέσθωσαν.*
† V. 21. 1. *διαταξάμενος τοῖς ἡγεμόσι.*
‡ III. 33. 6. *διέταξε αὐτῷ πῶς δεήσει.*
§ II. 33. 6. *πάντα διατάξας.* ‖ *ταῦτα διαταξάμενος.*

θεοῦ, "according to the order of God," three times in Pastorals, is used by Polybius of a commander presenting the order of his government. Scipio, for example, states the "orders"* of the Senate to Antiochus (21. 11. 9). Generals pass on the "orders" of the Legates (30. 10. 6). Heracleides receives the "order," ἐπιταγή, of King Philip. This word in 1 Tim. i. 1 and Tit. i. 3. may, therefore, imply that the apostle has a representative and delegated authority, that he is under orders himself and must exercise authority over others. This fact is likewise expressed by a military phrase, παραγγελία, 1 Tim. i. 5, 18, an order given by a general. So Polybius (6. 27. 1) described the position of the general's tent in the camp as being "the most suitable for issuing *orders*."† The verb itself "I order," παραγγέλλω, is used of an order passed along from the commander by his staff to the army. Polybius employed it of Scipio's orders to Lælius on the field of battle.‡ So here the apostle gives the order, παραγγέλλω, 1 Tim. vi. 13, and directs Timothy to pass it on, παράγγελλε. This explains the peremptory tone throughout, "must," δεῖ, occurring eight times§ and imperatives, a feature of Latin, abounding. The apostle is acting like a man under authority,‖ and at the same time entrusted with a high command or office, "I have been entrusted with a *stewardship*"¶ (1 Cor. ix. 17), "according to the *stewardship of God*** which was given to me" (Col. i. 25). Accordingly, he is "God's *steward*," θεοῦ οἰκονόμος. "Let a man regard us as "*stewards* of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1). He holds the position, then, of a steward, guardian or manager of "the household of God (οἶκος θεοῦ), the *church of God*" (1 Tim. iii. 15). This, then, in the apostle's estimation, is the highest position in the Church—to be God's steward, θεοῦ οἰκονόμος. And in Tit. i. 7 we find that it is *the* bishop, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, that is to act with authority delegated from the apostle, like the apostle himself, even "as God's steward," ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμος. Tit. i. 7-9 gives certain qualifications of presbyters, πρεσβύτεροι, the minimum required for any church office. Then it proceeds, "for it is necessary that the bishop (ὁ ἐπίσκοπος) should be . . ." This does not prove that the offices were identical. It merely implies that the *episcopus* was selected from the *presbyters*, a term always in the plural, unless 1 Tim. v. 19 signifies office—*e.g.*, 1 Tim. v. 17 and Tit. i. 5, whereas bishop is always singular and has the article (1 Tim. iii. 2, and Tit. i. 7). The office, ἐπισκοπή, itself suggests position and the highest, being used with a term that suggests desire for high office, the goal of

* ἐπιταγαί. † εἰς παραγγελίαν. ‡ X. 39. 4.
§ Tit. (3), 1 Tim. (3), 2 Tim. (2). ‖ ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος (Lk. vii. 8).
¶ οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι. ** ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ θεοῦ.

ambition. "If anyone desires (ὀρέγεται) the office of bishop, he wants a good work" (1 Tim. iii. 1). Diodorus Siculus (8 B.C.) frequently used this term in a good sense, and of the highest office—*e.g.*, "desiring a kingdom," "hegemony," "the post of general," "dynasty," etc.* We have also "desiring the best things,"† and "the first things." The Roman system for centuries before and after Christ fostered the spirit. Hence "ambitio," the canvassing of electors by candidates for office. From "quæstor," the first step, *primus gradus honorum*, a man might rise to be prætor, censor and consul. In the description of the deacons we find a similar "cursus honorum."‡ "Those who have held with credit the office of deacon (καλῶς διακονήσαντες) secure a good step (βαθμός) for themselves." Evidently this is in the Church, the household of God, οἶκος θεοῦ, which he proceeds to describe as "pillar," στῦλος, and "foundation (ἑδραίωμα) of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). Before we reach either colonnade or pavement we must ascend the steps. And there were many steps in some temples, that of Artemis having ten. The writer is evidently thinking of a temple, as in 1 Cor. xiii. where πάντα στέγει refers to the roof "covering all things." It is logical, then, to take βαθμός in the same metaphorical sense as στῦλος—*i.e.*, secure for themselves a good *step* in the "cursus honorum" of the Church. The Greek verb,§ used here, not in the Paulines, is employed by *zeugma* with "rank" and "right to speak," and may cover a Latin word like "adipisci" which might be used both of State honours‖ and of qualifications for such offices.¶ We frequently have a "step of dignity" (*Rep.* i. 27); "steps of offices" (*de off.* i. 45); "a step from the ædileship to the censorship" (Livy 17. 6); "a step to empire";** through all the steps of office, "per omnes honorum *gradus*" (*Cat.* i. 28); "steps of magistracies" (*Brut.* 81), where "gradus" means what βαθμός means here, a step from one post to another. The renderings "purchase for themselves a good degree," AV., or "gain to themselves a good standing," RV., miss the point. The writer means that the deacons may rise, as the Roman officials rose, in the State, from one step to another in the οἰκονομία θεοῦ. Some of them may become presbyters, as some of the latter may become bishops. The right to speak or preach for the cause, παῤῥησία

* ὀρεγόμενος βασιλείας (18. 23); ἡγεμονίας (30. 8); στρατηγίας (19. 23 (2); 17. 30). δυναστείας (11. 86).

† τῶν καλῶν ὀρ (37. 4.; 37. 29). It is also used in a bad sense in 2 Tim. iii. 3. But this is very rare in Diodorus (16. 65). τῶν πρωτείων (17. 54).

‡ Cic., *Fam.* 3. 11. 2, etc. § περιποιοῦνται.

‖ "*Gradum* consulatus *adipisci*" (Cic., *pro Mur.* 7); "amplissimos dignitatis gradus *adeptus*" (*Fam.* 10. 6).

¶ *Adipisci* sapientiam (Cic., *Leg.* 1. 22. 59).

** Gradus imperii (Cic., *Verr.* 2. 2. 1).

ἐν πίστει, apparently marks an advance in the position of the deacons. The office of bishop (*ἐπισκοπή*, without article, another Latin feature frequent in the Pastorals) has been shown to be used with a verb that technically implies desire for a higher office. The qualifications for that office are set forth in two passages, 1 Tim. iii. 1-7 and Tit. i. 7-9. The latter is much briefer and yet gives certain positive expressions of the former in negative and expanded forms, adding a touch of Cretan colour—*e.g.*, reasonable, *ἐπιεικής*, becomes *μὴ αὐθαδής*, not self-willed, while *διδακτικός*, apt to teach, is represented by two long phrases: *ἀντεχόμενος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου . . . παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν.* For in the midst of opponents the bishop must be a strong man, with a firm grip on doctrine, and able not only to instruct his own flock, but also to answer the questions and refute the statements of the adversaries of the faith. This was especially necessary among the Cretans, whose peculiar failings appear among those imputed to the enemy. For instance, the motive in "teaching what they ought not for the sake of sordid lucre," *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν* (Tit. i. 11), is a hit at Cretan cupidity, which is illustrated by a story in Diodorus Siculus (37. 17). A Cretan asked a reward for betraying his friends to the Romans. The general offered him citizenship. The Cretan rejected it with scorn, saying, "Our aim is gain (*κέρδος*); we do everything for money (*χάριν ἀργυρίου*)." Polybius* says among the Cretans no gain is thought shameful, *μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν κέρδος*. In the passage on slaves (Tit. ii. 10) "if they show fidelity (*πίστις*) in everything they may *adorn* (*κόσμῶσι*) the doctrine," the verb suggests that the lowest people in Crete may act like the highest in the land, the *κοσμοί*, the chief magistrates of Crete.† So rare was fidelity, *πίστις*, among the Cretans, that Cretan perfidy became a byword‡ and Polybius spoke of their "ingrained cupidity."§ The bishop must not be affected by the general tendency of the people. He must not be covetous (*αἰσχροκερδής*) like them. This is a harsher term than *ἀφιλάργυρος* of 1 Tim., and has far worse associations, and had point and sting in the present connection, for it implies that the bishop could be such, and probably was often such. He had the opportunity to be such, for funds were at his disposal for the dispensing of the hospitality of the community to passing strangers. He should be *φιλόξενος* (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8), a word not applied to either presbyters or deacons. His was, therefore, a more representative office than that of the pres-

* *παρὰ κρηταιεῦσι μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος* (vi. 46, 2).
† Aristotle, *Polit.* 2. 10. 6.; Polybius, etc.
‡ *ἡ συνήθης τοῖς κρησὶν ἀθεσία.* § VI. 46, 9. *τὴν ἔμφυτον πλεονεξίαν.*

byters. It is also possible that in the discharge of some of his financial duties he was assisted by deacons, appointed (Acts vi. 2) to serve tables, and who accordingly had also to be free from cupidity, *μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς* (1 Tim. iii.). The Cretans were also noted for their quarrelsome nature. Polybius speaks of their dissensions and tribal wars. This, too, comes out in the course of the epistle.

One qualification was a *conditio sine qua non* for all three orders, deacons, presbyters and bishops. They all should rule their own households and children (Bishop, 1 Tim. iii. 4): "ruling (*προϊστάμενος*) his own household well, having his children in submission with great reverence;"* (deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 12) "deacons ruling (*προϊστάμενοι*) well their own children and their own households;" (presbyters, Tit. i. 6) "having trustworthy (*πιστά*) children, not accused of *lewd behaviour*† or unsubmissive"—two more Cretan traits, *lack of fidelity and morals*. All must possess this qualification. But in only one case, that of the bishop, is the argument clinched so: "for if one does not know how to rule (*προστῆναι*) his own family, how shall he govern (*ἐπιμελήσεται*) the church of God?" (1 Tim. iii. 5.) The business of governor of the Church, *ἐπιμελητὴς ἐκκλησίας*, belongs only to God's steward, the *θεοῦ οἰκονόμος* of Tit. i. 7. As such the bishop takes precedence. For this is only said of him (Tit. i. 7). As *θεοῦ οἰκονόμος* certain duties peculiar to his office fall on him. He must visit his workers to superintend their work. In his representative capacity he has to receive strangers and dispense hospitality. He must therefore be a respectable, *ἀνεπίλημπτος*, and widely respected (to be well spoken of by those without) member of society (1 Tim. iii. 7). It is essential that he bear a good name not only for his own sake, but also for the Church. Cicero, when writing to his brother Quintus (*Q. Fr.* 1. 1.), proprætor of Asia (64 B.C.), stressed these two points—the wise management of his household, and the care for his reputation. He urged his brother to win "golden opinions from all sorts of people," "ad omnes partes bene audiendi" (1. 3), and to strive to win every man's good word "in omnium laude undique colligenda" (xiv. 41). (With this compare the Pastoral phrase *μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν*.) Quintus should avoid scandal either through his officials or himself. He must consider his reputation "laborare de existimatione." This can be applied, point for point, to the bishop of the Pastorals. Again, Cicero said that the foundations of the proprætor's

* *ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος.*

† *ἀσωτία.* Strabo (483) described the practice of vice among Cretan boys. Custom fostered the practice.

dignity are his own *integritas* and *continentia*, the modesty (*pudor*) of his staff, the serious and regular discipline of his household, "familiæ gravis et constans disciplina" (vi. 18). "This would seem divine," he adds, "in a day of bad morals and in such a dissolute province."* Such is Cicero's description of a country in which Timothy lived a century afterwards, and in which there was very little of that *familiæ disciplina* almost peculiar to the Roman system. It was doubtless because of his public character, as the representative of the Church in each district, that this point is chiefly urged upon the bishop.

The bishop is the "visitor" of his district. The office of ἐπισκοπή includes visitation. Both the verb and the noun imply this. Polybius (iv. 38. 11) speaks of the parts of the world which are visited, ἐπισκοπούμενα, and Diodorus Siculus (37. 28) has, "having the king as visitor (ἐπίσκοπος)—which implies criticism there—and spectator (θεατής)." This duty distinguished the bishop, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, from the presbyters. Titus is ordered (i. 5) to *appoint*†—a word with a semi-military meaning, being the official term for the appointment of officers—presbyters in the cities, κατὰ πόλιν. As Crete was noted for the number of its cities, being called by Homer and Strabo Crete "of the hundred cities," ἑκατόμπολις, this could not possibly refer to bishops. The expression "throughout the cities," κατὰ πόλιν, also implies that the presbyters were to remain in their πόλις, where by ruling fairly, καλῶς προεστῶτες, they might obtain advancement and reward (1 Tim. v. 17). The bishop, on the other hand, would, like Titus, go from city to city. This idea is also conveyed in the description of his office, ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμος (i. 7), as God's steward, and as having the guardianship (ἐπιμέλεια implied in ἐπιμελήσεται) of the Church of God (1 Tim. iii. 5). For stewardship or management (1 Tim. i. 4) is impossible without inspection or supervision. There are many passages in the *Œconomicus* of Xenophon which illustrate this point, in describing the duties of the *œconomus* or steward. In *Œcon.* xv. 53, ἐπισκοπεῖν is, indeed, used of visiting the sick, but there is a wider sense when it is used of the *œconomus*, for *œconomia* implies the oversight of everything in an estate, inside and out. In xi. 95, a visit to a farm is made during such operations as sowing and ploughing. Having made his inspection, ταῦτα ἐπισκεψάμενος, the steward gave his advice. The duty of the Persian officers called guardians, ἐπιμεληταί, was to supervise, ἐπισκοπεῖν, that is, to visit personally their own district (Œc. iv. 60). Xenophon called *œconomia* a "work," ἔργον, that is, employment

* "Tam depravatis moribus, tam corruptrice provincia."

† καθιστάναι—e.g., καταστήσαντες ὑπάτους—consuls (Polybius, 1. 16. 1).

(*munus*), a word used of professions—*e.g.*, *ἰατρικὸν ἔργον* (Xen., *Mem.* iv. 2. 5). So the first Pastoral (1 Tim. iii. 1) calls *episcope* an *ἔργον*, an employment. Xenophon says it is the duty of the good steward to rule or manage his own household well,* the very thing that is said of the bishop in 1 Tim. iii. 5. Xenophon argues that the steward who can manage his own *οἶκος* well can also, when he has experience and skill, "*manage* and *build up* the house of another, if one entrusted it to him."† The Greek "entrust," *ἐπιτρέποι*, means "made him his *ἐπίτροπος*." This also implies the opposite, that if a man had no capacity for ruling his own household, no one would make him a steward or *ἐπίτροπος*. The same principle applies to the bishop and God's household, *οἶκος θεοῦ* (1 Tim. iii. 15): "If a man is unfit to rule his own, how shall he take charge of the household of God?" Both terms "managing," *οἰκονομῶν*, and "building," *οἰκοδομῶν*, the household of another are used in the *Œconomicus*. In the Pastorals we have God's management, *οἰκονομία* (1 Tim. i. 4), with its variant *οἰκοδομία*, building,‡ implying both the management and the building up of a household not yet finished or perfect—the duty of the bishop (1 Tim. iii. 5, and i. 3). The office of guardian or *ἐπιμελητής* was included in that of the steward, *οἰκονόμος*, in both Strabo and the Pastorals, for the latter as bishop, *ἐπίσκοπος*, has the *ἐπιμελεία* of the Church, "how shall he be guardian (*ἐπιμελήσεται*) of the church of God?" (1 Tim. iii. 5). Strabo used both terms together, "things managed with so much care."§ He also described the priests as guardians, *ἐπιμεληταί*, of the sacred things (17. 1. 3). This is the name in Xenophon of military district officers (*Œc.* iv. 50 *f.*). Polybius used the term in a military sense (3. 79. 4). Strabo used it of the officers Alexander appointed over Alexandria (13. 1). After his death Lysimachus "took charge of the city," *ἐπεμελήθη τῆς πόλεως* (13. 1. 26)—*i.e.*, as guardian, *ἐπιμελητής*. We have "take charge of the land,"‖ "to be in charge of public buildings"¶ (*cf. ædiles*). This guardianship is a part of the episcopal ministration exclusively.

Compare the following parallels: (1) Tit. i. 3, "the preaching or gospel (*κήρυγμα*) with which I was entrusted (*ὃ ἐπιστεύθην*);" Tit. i. 7, "as the steward (*οἰκονόμος*) of God"; Tit. i. 1, "slave of God" (*δοῦλος*); and (2) Strabo 17. 13, "*freedmen* and *stewards* of Cæsar entrusted with his affairs."** So the freed-

* *οἰκονόμου ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι εὖ οἰκεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον.*
† *τὸν ἄλλου οἶκον οἰκονομοῦντα ὥσπερ καὶ οἰκοδομοῦντα.*
‡ *οἰκοδομή*; Irenæus, *ædificatio.*
§ *τὰ διὰ τοσαύτης ἐπιμελείας οἰκονομούμενα* (17. 13).
‖ *ἐπιμελοῦνται γῆς* (xvi. 1). ¶ *δημοσίων ἐπιμελουμένους οἰκοδημάτων.*
** *ἀπελεύθεροι καίσαρος καὶ οἰκονόμοι πεπιστευμένοι πράγματα.*

men of God and His Christ are His "managers" or "stewards" and entrusted with His work. And just as we have "to preside over," *προστῆναι*, and "to take charge of," *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, said of God's steward in 1 Tim. iii. 5, so we have "to manage," *προστατεύειν*, and "to take charge of," *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, said of Xenophon's steward (*Œc.* xi. 68). Xenophon says the steward, *ἐπίτροπος*, must take over, *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, "all his master wished him."* He must also be taught to rule the workers,† that is, he must be made fit to rule, *ἄρχειν ἱκανός* or *ἀρχικός* (xiii. 4). So Timothy is ordered to entrust what he has learnt from the apostles to *faithful* men, qualified to teach, *ἱκανοί διδάξαι*, others (2 Tim. ii. 2; *cf.* *διδακτικός*, 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24). Xenophon's steward is taught to manage his workers, by a system of praise and rewards, punishment and blame. He must give the better garments to the better worker.‡ "I do not think it right," said the master, "that the better workmen should receive the same as the worse ones."§ The same principle is laid down in 1 Tim. v. 7: "I think it right that the elders who have presided well should receive double pay." Compare the two phrases *οὐκ ἀξιῶ τῶν ἴσων* (Xenophon) and *διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν* (Pastoral) supported by the maxim, "The workman is worthy (*ἄξιος*) of his pay (*μισθός*)" (1 Tim. v. 18; Lk. x. 7; Matt. x. 10, *τροφῆς*). Xenophon's master says: "When I see the stewards distributing the best things to those who are most deserving (*πλείστου ἀξίοις*) I praise them not only enriching them, but also honouring (*τιμῶν*) them as gentlemen" (xiv. 10). The bishop is in the same way over the presbyters. Those he sees doing their work well, *καλῶς προεστῶτες*, he rewards with double pay, *διπλῆ τιμή* (1 Tim. v. 17).

Again, the farming metaphors all through the Pastorals show that the bishop as steward is, as it were, over "God's farm."‖ As Xenophon's *œconomus* presides over everything connected with the sowing, ploughing, reaping, planting and pruning of fruit trees¶—he devotes a whole chapter (xix.) to the planting (*φυτεία*) of the vine, olive and fig—so must the bishop in God's farm. He must *plant* himself like Paul (*ἐφύτευσα*, 1 Cor. iii. 6**) and, therefore, must not be a new *plant*, *νεόφυτος*,†† himself (1 Tim. iii. 6). Paul understood grafting, using the verb *ἐγκεντρίζω* six times in Rom. xi. 17-24. He described the

* *Œc.* xiii. *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὧν ἂν σὺ βούλῃ.*
† *ἄρχειν τῶν ἐργαζομένων.*
‡ *ἐργαστήρ*=*ἐργάτης* (1 Tim. v. 18).
§ *οὐδ' ὅπως τῶν ἴσων ἀξιῶ τοὺς ἀμείνους τοῖς κακίοσι τυγχάνειν.*
‖ *θεοῦ γεώργιον* (1 Cor. iii. 9); hapax, see Strabo, 16. 4. 71.
¶ C. xix. 1. ** *ἐφύτευσα.*
†† *Cf.* *σύμφυτος*, planted together (Rom. vi. 5); *ἔμφυτος*, ingrafted (James i. 21).

grafting of the wild "scion"* upon the cultivated tree as contrary to nature (*παρὰ φύσιν*). Theophrastus says this was done at times, but with inferior results (*Phys.* i. 3). "If you engraft the wild branch upon the cultivated stock it will not bear as good fruit." The new plant could hardly be said to be *rooted*, *ἐρριζωμένος*, in love (Eph. iii. 17), the taking root, *ριζοῦσθαι*, being an important problem for tree planters (*Œc.* xix. 53). In 1 Tim. vi. 10 avarice is described as a *root* (*ῥίζα*) of all sorts of bad growths. The writer may have been thinking of a mushroom's growth when he added "not puffed up" (*τυφωθείς*), as it seems to rise out of the mist and to be without substance. 2 Tim. ii. 6 also contains a metaphor from the steward: "The husbandman who works must have the first share of the fruits (or crops)," *μεταλαμβάνειν τῶν καρπῶν*. This implies that there is someone above him who will give him his share, *μετάληψις*,† such as the man who in Xenophon's work has the handling of the crops‡—the steward. Timothy is also urged to prove himself a good workman, *ἐργάτης*—a word often used of farm labourer—and cut straight (*ὀρθοτομεῖν*) the word of the Truth. Here the R.V. made three attempts, but did not see that it is a ploughing metaphor. The Christian workman must drive a straight furrow in the field of truth. He must not look back (Lk. ix. 62) or go aside from what is taught or written, or make a crooked furrow for his flock to follow, like the "arator *prævaricatur*" in Pliny (18. 19). This is exactly Hesiod's meaning, *ἰθεῖαν αὖλακ' ἔλαννοι* (*Erga* 441), Cato's "sulco ne vario ares" (*R.R.* 61. 1), Columella's "recto sulcare." Finally, Timothy is to entrust these directions to *faithful*, *πιστοί*, men, of the class who will be fit also to teach others, that is both *πιστοί* and *διδακτικοί*, for one must be faithful, *πιστός*, to be a steward, *οἰκονόμος* (1 Cor. iv. 2), and the bishop, God's steward, must be *διδακτικός*,§ like the steward of the *Œconomicus*. It is clear then that the bishop, in the writer's view, is the *œconomus* or steward in charge of the whole Church in his district. He is responsible as steward to the man who had handed over the trust to him, in this case St. Paul, who was acting through Timothy as his representative. Under him are the presbyters and the deacons. Some of the former were to labour in the word and teaching, and these were to have double honour or pay (1 Tim. iii. 17). Others of the presbyters were to help in the general work of the Church and the services (1 Tim. ii. 2) and to lead in every place appointed the prayers and supplications of the people (verse 8). Of the

* "We marry a gentler scion to the wildest stock" (*Winter's Tale*).
† 1 Tim. iv. 3 (hapax). ‡ *Œc.* 14. 5. *ὁ τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειριζόμενος.*
§ 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24.

deacons, some would help with the charities of the Church, the weekly collections, the registration of widows, while others, who were on the list for promotion, would be privileged to preach* and teach in the cause of Christ Jesus. Much is assumed, much lacks clearness, but certain facts emerge, with the help of the classics, about the episcopate.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

CLEMENT OF ROME†

I

THE series of medallions of the Popes skied above the long cornice of the nave of St. Paul's Without-the-Walls has all the impressiveness of Roman assurance. St. Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Anacletus—that is their order; but these portraits do not go back beyond the fifth century, and the early ones are quite conventional. As we stand beneath them we may well ask for their title-deeds. With regard to Clement, who is ranked third in order here, and second in the Liberian list, if we regard St. Peter as Apostle and not Bishop, the establishment of his claim must always to some extent rest on an estimate of probabilities, in which something subjective in the student will weigh down the balance of decision. Was Clement head of the Roman hierarchy in the first century? If he was, what was his date? If he was Pope, what did being Pope mean? At what moment of time did the Roman Church move into monarchical episcopacy? These, again, are questions to which available evidence provides no definite answer; our general impressions of likelihood are controlling factors in making a decision on the evidence we have.

Still more is this so when we take up the venerable document known to Eusebius as the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. If it is Clement's letter he has not signed it; it is the Epistle of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth. It is true that it is no composition of an ecclesiastical committee; no early writing is more instinct with personality; it is not difficult with Lightfoot to form a conception of the writer as we read his letter—his natural tendency to co-ordinate opposing schemes of doctrinal teaching; his sense of the universal reign of law, his ἐπιείκεια, a word occurring so often in his letter, sometimes qualified by the adjective ἐκτενής, "intense"; sweet reasonableness was a passion with him; we might add his

* παρρησία (1 Tim. iii. 13).

† A lecture read at Sion College, Tuesday, May 27, 1928.

sense of *wonder* which appears in the description of the phœnix. A definite and very attractive personality surely; but is it Clement or someone else? Or is it someone else of the same name?

Or once more the *Recognitions*, that religious novel of the second century with its alarums and excursions, and changing scenes, combined with the other pseudo-Clementine literature—what lies behind it? Out of what elements is the fairy-tale constructed? If we could pierce behind such later constructions, whom should we find? The Greek of the Pauline Epistle transported to Rome, consecrated after Linus and Cletus to the episcopate, one as Irenæus says "who had both seen the apostles and companied with them"? A Foreign Secretary occupied in the official correspondence of his Church? An "unassuming chairman" of a band of presbyters? The freedman of a member of the Imperial family exercising Christian influence in the very house of Cæsar, nay, Flavius Clemens himself, husband of Domitilla, a Christian-martyr and inhabitant of the house which is the third stage below the church of San Clemente? Or a "vacillating wraith" flitting from place to place in the papal lists, the memory of a name, the fancy of later days masquerading in flesh and blood?

The reality of Clement's position, his identity with the writer of the epistle, his connection with the Imperial Flavian family, and his date of office in the time of Domitian, with a conviction of the reality and severity of the Persecution of Christians under Domitian, were the notes of Lightfoot's results woven on the basis of most meticulous research. They dominated English ecclesiastical thought for years. It would be foolish to deny that no subjective factor animated Lightfoot's decisions, for he was engaged in fighting the poisonous assumptions of the Tübingen School, and the date of Clement was important in his argument. Opinion today would hardly make as much as he did of the Persecution under Domitian; Mr. Henderson,* for instance, considers it merely Domitian's destruction of aristocrats dangerous to himself: it happened that Flavius, Clemens, Domitilla, and Glabrio, who may or may not have been Christians, were among the victims, but the Persecution as a whole cannot be substantiated on the available evidence.†

But a writer who definitely proposes to upset the Lightfoot tradition is Dr. Elmer Truesdell Merrill, a Classical Professor in the University of Chicago, whose *Essays in Early Christian History* appeared in 1924. He is a critical scholar who writes

* B. W. Henderson, *Five Roman Emperors*, pp. 45-47.

† Although Ramsay still regards the denial of the reality of the Second Persecution as traditionally understood as "wrecking the foundations of ancient history" (Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, XII., p. 259).

very attractively, but like everyone else in approaching religious history he can hardly be said to be free from the sway of his prepossessions. Yet he is most plausible; when his book came out I found one of our most scholarly archdeacons well-nigh led captive by his radical decisions.

To Dr. Merrill there is no real evidence for Clement's existence; he is a "vacillating wraith," a "will-o'-the-wisp," "a creation ad hoc"; criticism sweeps him away, and archæology can do nothing to bring him back.

But what is the evidence which is thus treated so lightly? Where is Clement first mentioned in literature as Bishop of Rome? It must be admitted that it does not occur very early. It is in Irenæus (*Adv. Hæreses* iii. 3. 3), who states that St. Peter and St. Paul founded the Roman Church, and made Linus Bishop, that Anacletus succeeded Linus, and "Clement third after him became bishop, one who had seen and known the apostles, and shared with many who were still alive at the time the memory of the apostles' preaching, traditions, and personal instruction."

Irenæus wrote thus about the year A.D. 180. But since we know that he was in Rome after A.D. 175 on an embassy to the then Pope Eleutherus, we are at liberty to carry back his evidence some fifteen years. At least we may say that in 165 it must have been a recognized tradition in Rome that the Clement mentioned by St. Paul had been Bishop seventy years before.

But before or during the visit of Irenæus to Rome, another person of great importance in the discussion was making a very long stay in the Imperial city; indeed, he seems from his own account to have lived there for eleven years, until the accession of Eleutherus. This was Hegesippus, a writer whose works are almost solely known from Eusebius; but as he refers to him with the greatest respect (and Eusebius was not always respectful even to bishops), and according to his custom gives actual quotations of some length, we are enabled to form some idea of his capacities. Now Hegesippus was a Palestinian Christian, and he was keenly sensitive to the welter of heresy in which the Church was involved. Was there a voice of authority amid the confusion? he asked himself in his Eastern home, as many do today. Was there a *punctum stans* amid clashing creeds around him? It seemed to him that a tradition must have been handed down from the Apostles in the Churches which claimed descent from them, and that the doctrine preserved in such apostolical hands must be true, and that in such doctrine commonly held in the great Churches he would find what he wanted—a standard of truth, a balance against which

to weigh the assertions of Valentinians or Marcionites. So he set forth to investigate the Churches for himself. He tells us that "he conversed with most of the bishops on his way, and received the same doctrine from all," an experience that is hardly possible in England today. We find him definitely at Corinth, staying with Primus, the bishop, enjoying his talk, in a visit of some days during which agreement about doctrine made conversation a real pleasure. There was nothing heretical about the views of Primus. Then Hegesippus went on to Rome, and met Bishop Anicetus, and his deacon Eleutherus, who himself became Bishop in 175, when Anicetus and his successor Soter had passed away.* Here, again, the inquirer was well satisfied with the staple teaching; it was in accordance with the requirements "of the Law and the Prophets and the Lord." But Hegesippus did something important at Rome. "At Rome," he writes, "I made a list of the Roman succession up to Anicetus" (*διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου*). Not a little hangs on those words. The existence of an authenticated list of Roman Bishops shortly after 150, including Clement, is a point which discussion must recognize.

The inferior reading *διατριβὴν ἐποιησάμην* (which occurs in not one of the ancient MSS.) for *διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην* must be noted, if only because Harnack accepted it. It would, of course, destroy the evidential value of the passage. But as Lightfoot and Merrill both accept *διαδοχήν*, and in view of the fact that Hegesippus claimed to have made a list of Bishops at Rome, as no doubt he had done elsewhere, we need not consider further the reading *διατριβήν*.† The important thing for us is to imagine sanely what it meant to construct an episcopal pedigree of the Roman succession in Rome itself about the year 160. We have to consider what records and inscriptions there were to guide the inquiry, if there were no actual list; we have to ask what living memory there was among Christians past middle age of the men who were prominent in their Church fifty or sixty years before, which would run back to Lightfoot's date for Clement (96). There were differences in the Papal lists about the exact place of Clement, but this is due probably to Cletus and Anacletus being one person, and the necessity for finding a place for the double that the mistake created.‡ This uncertainty about the early Popes would explain why Hegesip-

* According to Lightfoot the latest date possible for the accession of Anicetus is 154, since Polycarp was martyred in 155. So that this visit of Hegesippus may have begun as early as 154. If he stayed till the accession of Eleutherus in 175 he cannot have arrived till 164 near the end of the episcopacy of Anicetus.

† It is a misfortune that it is stereotyped in the old Bohn translation of Eusebius, and even in Dr. Kidd's recent book of select historical passages.

‡ Also St. Peter is sometimes outside the list, and sometimes reckoned as first Bishop.

pus says "I made a list." Let us admit that there was some uncertainty which had to be unravelled, and that the work Hegesippus undertook implied that various views on the succession had to be critically sifted.

But if Hegesippus made a list, where is the list that Hegesippus made? Unfortunately Eusebius does not quote it, and all discussion on the basis of it would therefore be useless, if Lightfoot had not established the practical certainty that it is the list preserved by Epiphanius (A.D. 354), which differs very little from the other Papal lists, which therefore most likely spring from a common literary source. Dr. Merrill will have no objection to the brilliant hypothesis of Lightfoot—for it becomes the base of his attack upon the existence of Clement. All the evidence, he says, runs back to Hegesippus' statement and goes no further. "I made a list." Behold—the creator of Clement—Hegesippus. Thus we are actually told that this inquiring spirit from Palestine presented the Roman Church, which up till then had been strangely uninterested in the story of its origin and early days, with a full-blown pedigree, as the Heralds' College might do for a *nouveau riche*. Hegesippus is ultimately the source of the "legend" of Bishop Clement, who penned an Epistle to Corinth during his episcopate, and who became, strange to say, in the next twenty years, after his invention by Hegesippus, a figure about whom legend and fairy-tale gathered, especially in the East. It was to a lay-figure invented by Hegesippus that the Clementine legends were fitted.

We are then required to envisage the Roman Church, say in the year 160, as so ignorant of its Government sixty years before that it did not know whether there had been a Clement among its ἡγούμενοι or not; it had no records, no archives, no monumental inscriptions, and actually no traditions. It is impossible to believe that a close community like a primitive Church retained no memory of its officials who had died when its old men were children. Let us admit that historical accuracy was not a strong point in the early Church, but it is another thing to assert that its corporate memory was so weak that the officials of 160 whom Hegesippus must have consulted, Anicetus and Eleutherus themselves, were ready to acknowledge anyone he chose to suggest as their predecessor sixty years before. The assertion "I made a list" will hardly carry so far as that.

Hegesippus may be regarded as a trustworthy reporter. He did not write connected history, but seems to have embodied the results of his studies in five books which he called ὑπομνήματα or *Memories*. Eusebius says they contained "a record of the

certain teaching of the apostolic teaching in a very simple arrangement"* (*σύνταξις*), and he regards him as one of the most distinguished champions of the orthodox faith, aroused by the heresies of the second century.

There are the following quotations from him in Eusebius:

(i.) An allusion to the deification of Antinous, which of course has abundant historical support.

(ii.) An account of the martyrdom of St. James the Just, which is very full, but does not conflict with that of Josephus, and bears unmistakable evidence of the reports of eye-witnesses.

(iii.) An account of the martyrdom of Simeon, which apparently bears the stamp of truth; and

(iv.) The famous record of the appearance of the kinsmen of the Lord before Domitian. In this story he is certainly not inventing; nor does his simple account of what is said to have happened show any signs of imaginative embroidery. It may be true or false, but Hegesippus cannot be considered to have falsified it. Dr. Henderson, a secular historian, in his most recent book, does not discredit it. "The simple story," he says, "tallies with the Emperor's character, and with all else that is surely known concerning the Flavian attitude of indifference towards the Christian Church" (*Five Roman Emperors*, p. 51).

All this goes to prove that Hegesippus was not an imaginative inventor, but a patient and plodding recorder of tradition and fact.

But you will ask whether the existence of a letter known as the Epistle of Clement from Rome to Corinth may not have suggested the notion that the writer was Bishop of Rome at the date when it was assumed to be written. We really cannot say, for we have no direct literary evidence that the Epistle was ascribed to a Clement before the episcopate of Soter (166-174).

There is the letter of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth in that episcopate, in answer to a letter from the Roman to the Corinthian Church, in which Dionysius reports that the letter from the Roman Church has been read in Church that very Sunday, and that they propose to read it publicly from time to time as they do the former letter written "*διὰ Κλήμεντος*." His is the earliest ascription of the letter to Clement in, say, about the year 170. But who can say how much further back the ascription of it to Clement goes, if the Bishop of the See that treasured it could allude to it so confidently as his? But of course the quotation from Dionysius does not state that Clement was Bishop of Rome, only that he was the

* Eusebius, iv., 7. 15.

writer of the Epistle: we must wait for Irenæus to do that after 180.*

We have, then, two quotations in Eusebius, the one from Hegesippus, describing the letter as an epistle from the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, the second from the Bishop of Corinth, Dionysius, in 170, stating that it is read in his Church on Sundays, and ascribing it simply to a Clement to whom he does not give the title of Bishop, but who is, or was, presumably a well-known man. In addition, there is the detailed statement of Irenæus a little later, which says that it was written when Clement was Bishop of Rome, but does not ascribe the authorship to him. It is not till A.D. 200 that Origen actually calls it the work of Clement, Bishop of Rome, the convert of St. Paul.

W. J. FERRAR.

(To be continued.)

PERFECTION WITHOUT COMPROMISE

ARE we to teach and to preach and to act as though there were but one standard for all and that standard were Perfection? The early Christians set before themselves a very high standard indeed. Our Lord had said: "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." Nothing short of perfection, therefore, would do. Neither the pursuit of happiness for oneself or for others, nor abstract "rightness" or "goodness," nor the keeping of the Law was thought of as the Ideal. But Perfection as God is perfect. The veriest flaw, the most venial fault must be regarded with distress because it hindered perfection. Such things as innocent amusements, or occupations like that of a schoolmaster, apparently lawful enough for a follower of Christ, were suspect or condemned if in any way associated with the heathen world.

Perhaps the most illuminating example of this aiming at perfection was Tertullian, whose stern morality almost makes us shudder. The ideal of perfection produced many beautiful and wonderful characters. It was the moral earnestness and "other-worldliness" of the early Christians which so impressed the heathen world. There was a humility and peaceful content in face of persecution even, which was proof against all adversity.

* This Dionysius of Corinth was as represented by Eusebius (iv. 23) a man of weight in the Greek ecclesiastical world. He wrote epistles rebuking heresy to the Lacedæmonian, Athenian and other Churches. He apparently was of more liberal tendency than his neighbours, differing from Pinytus, Bishop of Gnossos, on the ideal of purity; indeed, the latter informed him that the teaching in his last letter was so much milk-and-water; an opinion with which Eusebius seems to agree.

The *Imitatio Christi*, so long as it was loving obedience to the Will of God, in the spirit of Jesus Christ, was then and still is the Perfect Ideal, as also the ideal of Perfection, but before many years had passed, we find the bane which undermined true morality creeping in even here in a literal attempt to follow the Man Jesus. "The direct copying of Christ really limits its imitation to the Religious sphere, to a life in which religion must not merely be the animating sentiment, but also the immediate aim of human action, its immediate content and material. As Christ lived for the religious ideal, unembarrassed by worldly concerns, His followers—thus it is concluded—should also be in the world as He was, and live exclusively for the religious ideal."

Some felt that it could not even stop at this; but that martyrdom was an essential; so that though "true martyrdom is founded in the historic condition of the world and the historic situation, we see already in these early times that false imitation with many who, in fanatic arrogance and vanity, pressed forward to martyrdom, in order thus to attain to perfect likeness to the Lord."*

The ideal of the *Imitatio Christi* impelled men and women to leave the world and depart into "desert country." They took vows of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience; and though these do not deserve the hard words of Dr. Martensen that "the whole of this aspiration after material likeness to Christ . . . . is founded on a false conception of Christ, and the significance of His coming, and on a false conception of Christianity towards the human,"† yet it is certainly true that unless the devotion is *to* our Lord and *for* His work, it is open to criticism. If renunciation, extraordinary self-denial, obedience, poverty and chastity are undertaken merely in a *literal* attempt to imitate Christ, to conform to His material likeness, it leaves out of account the purpose of our Lord's mission, and confines the following of Him and of the Christian Ideal to the few. For as Martensen justly remarks: "Christ does not desire only denial of the world, and renunciation of it, but also the ennobling of the world, and its enlightenment. Nothing human is alien to Him, and His Kingdom is compatible with everything except sin."‡ And Scaramelli points out that "voluntary poverty which is proper to 'religion' is not for everybody in the world. For many are under obligation to make good use of those things which they possess. So chastity, which pertains to those who are cloistered, is not proper for those who live in the bonds of matrimony."§

* Martensen, *Christian Ethics* (General), pp. 295 ff. † *Ibid.*, p. 296.
‡ *Ibid.* § Scaramelli, *Guide Ascetique.*

Real likeness to Christ is therefore not likeness in external circumstances and employments of life, but likeness to Him in the disposition of the mind—likeness to Christ's Will. This likeness may be found as easily in the lay conditions as in ecclesiastical, as easily with those who bear their cross in secret as with those who become historic martyrs. "One should not lose sight of the fact that perfection is not identical for all. That of the man of the world differs from that of 'a religious,' as that of a young person without responsibilities differs from that of one with family cares."*

Christ only developed His own personal perfection whilst He executed the work which His Father had given Him to do for human society; and in this every Christian should imitate Him. "Must I not be about My Father's business?"

The defect of Asceticism is that it may be merely the exercise of a virtue which has no other substance than the virtue itself. It may, occupied with its own blessedness, take no count of society at all; undertake no duty for its benefit. There can be nothing but praise for the high resolve which impels and the courage that enables men and women to leave the world and follow Christ along the road of Poverty, Humility and Chastity. There can be no possible doubt that such a Vocation is a very blessed one. Nor can we be blind to the debt which the world owes to the Religious Orders. Our concern has been with defective views rather than with right conceptions, and it has led us a little way from our problem. But it will easily be seen that if the *Imitatio Christi* was conceived to be a material likeness it could only be attempted by 'religious.' In point of fact this was recognized and gave rise to a "two-standard" idea. The standard of perfection for 'religious'; the standard of "the best under the circumstances" for the ordinary folk. The latter may even have been an easier standard than that. If it was obvious that you could not be a tailor and at the same time "take up your cross and follow Christ" in its literal sense, then it must be the duty of the Church to supply some alternative. This was effected by making it the duty of the 'religious' to supply for the ordinary folk what the latter lacked of zeal and devotion. Hence the seeds are sown of a particularized doctrine of "Merits."

Now it is, of course, obvious that such a division has many defects. It is definitely rejected by the Church of England, and in this we may believe she is nearer the Mind of Christ. If, however, we—as is right—put before men a standard of Perfection, does this not produce in many a feeling of despair

* Scaramelli, *Guide Ascetique*.

at the outset? If you face a novice with a mountain, he will feel it impossible to climb it, and will be discouraged thereby from the attempt. If you take one who has never learned to swim to watch an expert swimmer, or a music pupil to hear a master, and say to him that he there beholds the standard of attainment, the result may be only discouragement at the hopelessness of the task and a consequent cessation of any attempt to progress at all. So it is in religion. The suggestion of immediate perfection and nothing short of it as the only morality at which to aim has sometimes the reverse of the result hoped for. It is too staggering.

Thus St. Philip Neri is said to have remarked: "It is no good wishing to do everything in an instant, nor to hope to become a saint in four days."*

It is one of the weaknesses of our system in the Church of England that we, so to speak, hurl Perfection or nothing at the heads of our people, and leave them to make what they can of it. The result, as Canon Quick assures us,† is that we have, in fact, to recognize a lower moral standard than any other branch of Christendom.

But Perfection must be the ultimate ideal, attainable, if not in this world, at least in the next. As Professor Sorley puts it in noble words: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be. But if free minds endure, it must surely be for a range of activity suited to the capacities and values which they have acquired in their mundane experience. And if here, or elsewhere, they attain that complete harmony between will and ideal in which moral perfection consists, they will surely be fitted thereby for nobler enterprise. It is not true that it is impossible for a morally perfect man to exist and work in an imperfect world. The view is merely an echo of a narrowly hedonistic theory of what constitutes goodness and perfection. On the contrary, the more perfect a man is, the greater is the variety of conditions in which he will master each situation and prove his goodness. As long as the time-process continues we can conceive free minds as working towards the goal of moral perfection; we can even think of them as, themselves made perfect, still pressing forward into new and untried ways."‡

In this case, then, Perfection is not only regarded as attainable, but the road to that attainment is seen to be one along which it is necessary to press forward; a road that passes through the barrier of this life into the beyond.

* Quoted: Gaume, *Manuel des Confesseurs*, p. 13. See also Shieler-Heuser, Section 3, Article 2 (p. 537), *Theory and Practice of the Confessional*.

† *The Testing of Church Principles*, p. 67.

‡ Sorley, *Moral Values*, p. 516.

While, therefore, it is right to reject the "two-standard" theory in the sense of one standard for the clergy and 'religious,' and another for the laity: while it is right to uphold a standard of Perfection as the only true ideal; we must not lose sight of the fact that human beings differ as well in their capacities as in their environment. Some *kind* of double standard is necessary, as when a child is to be taught music we do not tell him to aim directly at being a Paderewski; we say, "First the scales, then a short piece," and so on, as the case may be; or, in mountain climbing, "Smaller and easier hills and mountains first, then the highest peaks." It should be remembered, too, that to aim at what one feels to be within the range of possibility, and then to achieve, may lead on to further progress until one day one does attain to the summit, which one knew to be there all the time.

So in training souls for Heaven the Christian Priest must remember that immediate Perfection seems to them impossible of attainment, and the thought of it is discouraging both to those who are beginning the religious life and those who have obstacles to surmount. Progress is often gradual, and generally slow; so that the notion of immediate Perfection must, save in the case of a few specially gifted and favoured souls, give way to that of mediate or gradual progress towards the perfect bliss of Union with God in Christ.

Scaramelli, quoting St. Thomas Aquinas, says that there are three degrees of Charity; the beginning, the developing and the perfect. So, on the road to Perfection there is (1) the Purgative stage, when one tries with all his power to purify the soul of sin committed, to conquer bad habits that have been contracted, and to check rebel and impetuous passions. (2) The Progressive stage, when one is able to abstain easily from mortal sin and exercise oneself in the moral and theological virtues with ardour, without however being ree from the lighter faults. And (3) the stage of Pure Love, when one is proceeding with strength towards conquest of self and with gaiety of heart and love exercising oneself in the virtues.

The problem that has been raised is a very real problem. The systematization of Christian Ethics is in no small measure due to a recognition of its difficulties. But it is well also to remember that along with a recognition of the difficulties Moral Theology uses the aids to attainment which our faltering footsteps so sorely need, namely Prayer and Sacraments. The Priest needs to remember St. Paul's principle: "First milk, as for babes, then meat as for full-grown men." His study must also be, not only God and the Divine Nature and Will, but human kind as well; human nature and its wilful desires.

"The human which denies Christianity is not genuine humanity; just as the Christianity which denies the human is not genuine Christianity."

Nor, in conclusion, must we necessarily think of Moral Perfection as being ultimately all-sufficient, for "It is not only evil (that is, moral evil) that has to be mastered. The artist or the man of science has not been fighting against moral evil in his effort to produce things of beauty or to enlarge the sphere of knowledge. . . . It is conceivable that moral evil might be overcome, and yet that adventure would not cease. There would still be call and room for pressing further into the unknown and making all things subservient to the values which it is the function of free spirits to realize."*

The mission of the Priest is to help the souls committed to his care in this great, grand, upward adventure. And just as in any expedition or army the grades of capacity vary, so in the Christian Army no two are exactly alike. It is the Priest's duty to put that before the individual or group which in their present state of development they regard as possible of attainment; never forgetting, of course, the highest peak, nor indeed omitting to see that its shadow looms in the consciousness of those whom he is directing.

H. S. MARSHALL.

NOTE.—Bishop Jeremy Taylor in Section 3, Paragraph 45, *Unum Necessarium*, says, "Evangelical Perfection is such as supposes a beginning, an infant grace, progression and variety." And again, quoting St. Paul, "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling; let, therefore, as many as be perfect be thus minded": "That is to say, no man can do the duty of the Christian, no man can, in any sense, be perfect, but that he adds virtue to virtue, and one degree of grace unto another." (Section 4, Paragraph, 14.)

---

* Sorley, *Moral Values*, p. 516.

STEPHEN LANGTON*

THE seven-hundredth anniversary of Stephen Langton's death might easily have passed unnoticed. He was a great archbishop, but his personality does not leave a clear-cut impression on our minds. Yet, when once expressed, the thought of this celebration must have struck all of us as happy and appropriate, stirring within us feelings of cordial, if vague, satisfaction, reviving within us a sense of intimacy with the past, indefinable, perhaps elusive, yet undeniably sincere, as though some long-forgotten memory had begun to work. Why should we feel like this about a man of whom we know so little?

Our first thought, I suppose, is that Stephen was an Englishman. He was the tenth archbishop of Canterbury after the Norman Conquest, and the first great English ecclesiastic in the primacy since the days of Dunstan. His two immediate predecessors, Baldwin and Hubert Walter, may be described as Englishmen; the others, from Lanfranc onwards, were Italians or Normans. Neither Baldwin nor Hubert Walter was a great archbishop, although the one was a good and worthy man, the other a great statesman. Stephen was a good man, a statesman, and also a great archbishop.

When he died, July 9, 1228, seven hundred years ago, he was between sixty and sixty-five years of age. Since his boyhood he had, until ten years before, hardly been in England. Two troubled years after the great quarrel between King John and the Church (the years of the Charter, 1213-15), then from 1218, ten years as archbishop. He had come to manhood, to maturity, and to fame as a master in Paris; he had been called to the papal court as a cardinal and, like other Englishmen, might well have spent the last part of his life attached to the Curia, an ecclesiastical statesman at headquarters. An accident —so it must have seemed—made him archbishop of Canterbury in 1206. Then came seven weary years of strife, argument, anxiety, relieved by long quiet days of study and meditation in the Cistercian abbey of Pontigny, the refuge of St. Thomas of Canterbury before him, of St. Edmund of Canterbury after him. In 1213 a prospect of peace and reconciliation was opened in England by the submission of the King, but the task of restoration was more wearisome, more anxious, than the period of waiting. Stephen was found to be a man of independent outlook, no wary go-between, but a real English prelate, trouble-

* An oration delivered at Canterbury on the occasion of the seventh centenary of Stephen Langton's death.

some to King and Pope alike. He was suspended from his duties and was under a cloud for nearly three years, from the late summer of 1215 till the spring of 1218. He was well over fifty before he began his unquestioned rule as head of the Church in England and chief adviser to the boy King. He outlived Henry III.'s minority a little more than a year. The curious tomb which is said to mark his resting-place in this great church, half inside, half out, is not a bad symbol of his life: half in, half out of England; half a scholar, half an ecclesiastic; a friend of monks, yet a stalwart secular; a man drawn to the contemplative, yet choosing the active life; a cardinal convinced of the Divine mission of the Church universal, a practical archbishop responsive to local needs and the value of local custom and local men; a champion of the liberties of all, yet a mainstay of unity and order.

Stephen Langton came of a Lincolnshire family. His father was an inconspicuous landholder, probably of English or Anglo-Danish stock—what in these days we call a gentleman farmer. A farm, the site of the old manor-house, to the west of the church at Langton-by-Wragby, is still surrounded by a moat which may have enclosed Stephen's home. Church and farm lie on the high ground some miles to the east of Lincoln; they look out over a spacious landscape of woodland and cornfield; the prospect, like the air, is fresh, clean, and untroubled. The memory of such a home can keep a young man steady, give a sanction, a value to integrity as part of the nature of things; it may retain such a hold over his loyalty that, however far away he may be, however long his absence, he always feels himself to be a stranger and foreigner until he returns to his native land. Stephen's political letters express a deep affection for his country; when he fears lest his duty to his God and to the Church should be weakened by his love for England, and repudiates the suggestion that long residence in Paris has made him indifferent, he writes with obvious sincerity.

Two popular schools of thought in this country about the Middle Ages, although they are in agreement about nothing else, agree in thinking that the thirteenth century is too remote from us to justify any sense of intimate sympathy. The one school would say that even the commonsense view of the plain man about the Middle Ages is a piece of idealism. Life then, if we revisited it, would be a horrible yet fascinating nightmare of filth and cruelty, shot through and through by glorious streaks of the sanity which few can ever reach, for it is the sanity which comes from a sense of perfect communion with God. The other school would say that the commonsense view of the plain man is almost sacrilegious. Life then was far too fresh, spontaneous,

adventurous, devout, for our muddy comprehension, though shot through and through by evil things which have the brightness of Lucifer. There was, indeed, much in Langton's mind and experience, for there was much in the world about him, which would perplex us as strange and difficult. The stress differs from age to age. The rhythm of life, so to speak, changes, just as musical modes, familiar enough to one generation, sound odd to another generation. But the study of history is a vain pursuit if there is no continuity in life and thought. The objects for which men strive change, their moral values may change, but two things do not change, and these are mental coherence or the intelligible, and moral coherence, the quality always recognizable in character because it has health. We do not imagine that Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was really unintelligible to Aquinas, or that Vergil could not be appreciated by Dante. And, similarly, when we find men whose minds were steeped in the Scriptures and who lived in this land of ours, where for hundreds of years their fathers had lived before them, speaking words which we can translate and doing things which seem to us to be normal and sensible things to do, we are not justified in supposing that their health was not our health. That they saw some things more clearly than we see them, and that they did some things which we should not do, is a stimulus to our curiosity, not a barrier to our understanding.

But, we are told, national feeling, patriotism, sense of race, political tradition, did not exist or were quite different in those days: may not the feeling of intimacy with a man like Langton be a delusion—a consequence, not a cause, of our idea that we are bound by some spiritual kinship to the English of the days of Alfred or Dunstan or Chaucer? There is, indeed, a deep mystery here, but I doubt if the passage of time alone has created it. We may respect, yet be unable to appreciate our neighbours, and we are wont to say, in explanation of some forms of incompatibility, that certain people are not typically English. Or we recognize an English quality in a man who may be repellent to us on other grounds. However strange his speech, however puzzling his actions, he has something in common with us. Time does not run against this kind of Englishman.

By a not unnatural confusion, we are disposed to imagine that real Englishmen must always have thought as we think. Yet how few of us, if pressed, would agree with Sir Thomas More or with Oliver Cromwell, two of the most typical Englishmen of all time. Langton was not an Anglican clergyman in disguise; in fighting for the liberties of the Church, he was not fighting for the freedom of an independent Church of England. Perhaps what is common to all Englishmen of this type

is that they give free rein to the English quality in them. Some men seem to distort this quality, or breathe an air of mystification into it, or even expel it. Our Englishry is compatible, for example, with wholehearted service to the cause of empire, or peace, or the Pope, but it is not compatible, until it is so affected, with some kinds of imperialism, pacifism, and ultramontanism. We have modern parallels to Langton's difficulties. Bishop Ullathorne described the behaviour of Manning as un-English; but W. G. Ward gibed at the English Catholics as schismatic and anti-Papal. Manning said on the University question: "The English national spirit is spreading among Catholics, and we shall have dangers." Newman, on the other hand, wrote: "I prefer English habits of belief and devotion to foreign, from the same causes and by the same right which justifies foreigners in preferring their own. In following those of my people, I show less singularity and create less disturbance than if I made a flourish with what is novel and exotic. And in this line of conduct I am but availing myself of the teaching which I fell in with on becoming a Catholic."

Stephen Langton was English. He was even a typical Englishman, in the sense that he seems to speak, not so much for himself, as for something fundamental, a characteristic in the best Englishmen of all periods. Yet he was not an insular Englishman. He brought back and gave to England what he had learned on the Continent. He is of the company of St. Wilfrid and St. Dunstan. We misunderstand the development of English society and institutions if we neglect the foreign influences which have persistently been at work in our country. There is something distinctive, a unique quality, in English history, but—until the eighteenth century at any rate—this quality is the result of the penetration of the West. A people which could survive the Norman Conquest and help to create an Anglo-Norman civilization could survive and also absorb anything. Stubborn persistency and receptiveness, not insularity, are the marks of the English throughout their history. They acquired early the habit of giving and taking, taking and giving. St. Boniface and Alcuin almost literally gave Western Europe a new start, but they came from a land which had been fertilized by Gregory the Great and Theodore of Tarsus. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the process of taking and giving was so continuous that England, on the edge of the known world, was drawn into a cosmopolitan society. Langton's life falls in the middle of this period, which began with the Arabic scholars and the monastic theologians of the early twelfth century and ended with the brilliant group of Oxford men who passed to and fro between England and France in the early

fourteenth century. He grew to manhood in the schools of Paris and, when he was suddenly promoted to the cardinalate in 1206, had become their most eminent teacher. His work as archbishop and statesman was as clearly connected with his academic and intellectual interests as was the work of Pecham and Laud, but he was a much bigger man than either of these.

Langton studied and taught in Paris at a most interesting time. The cathedral schools were famous, and these were the years of their transition to the corporation of masters which was to be the governing element in the future university. As happens in a modern university, the cathedral schools of the twelfth century acquired atmosphere—their fame depended upon the vigorous interests which were prevalent there. Thus Chartres had been the main centre of humanistic studies. In Paris the humanities, law and medicine were taught, but theology was the dominating interest, and in Langton's time it was a practical, moral theology, closely linked with the careful, but by no means stereotyped exegesis of the Scriptures. Many other tendencies were at work, but their effects had not yet been felt, or, if felt, had not seriously disturbed the influence of the great masters. The Paris of St. Thomas Aquinas was to grow out of the Paris of Stephen Langton, just as, to take a later illustration, the Oxford of Jowett and Green grew out of the Oxford of Dr. Pusey; but in Langton's classroom the new Aristotle and the systematic dialectic of the schoolmen had no place. Langton had gone through the usual course in arts. He could cite Priscian and Boethius, make a somewhat fumbling and perfunctory use of formal logic, and quote tags from Cicero and the poets. But his real strength lay in what, I suppose, is now called pastoral theology. To this term, however, we must give a wide, far-reaching extension. Langton's outlook was the reverse of parochial. He grew up in the tradition or society of men who, on a broad basis of biblical and patristic, also in some degree of legal studies, were wont to face the outstanding issues in theology, ethics, and discipline. Moreover, the masters in the great cathedral schools of Paris were not recluses, expounding as dogma a well-defined system which they could not touch and never had to administer. It is very doubtful if medieval scholars at any time would have been satisfied with or would have deserved this modern description of their function. Certainly, if applied to the half-century which includes the great Lateran Councils of 1179 and 1215, such an estimate of their position would be ludicrous. The ecclesiastical system was passing through the process of definition, and the masters took the lead in the discussions. Matters to which time and authority were to give all the prestige of unquestioned truth were still

open, or had been settled so recently as still to be within the region of criticism. For example, Gerald of Wales, a gossipy but well-informed writer of Langton's time, tells us that he had heard no less a man than Petrus Comestor deplore the imposition of celibacy upon the clergy as one of the most disastrous decisions ever made in the history of the Church.

Langton devoted himself in the main to the study of the Bible. He is said to have commented upon all the books of the Old and New Testaments, including, of course, the Apocrypha, which was distributed among the books of the Old Testament. Some of his commentaries have not survived, and none of them have been printed. To judge from the manuscript evidence, his most popular works were the commentaries upon the Pentateuch, the four books of Kings, and the Minor Prophets, the last of which is stated in some copies to have been compiled in the year 1203. In the course of this comprehensive task of exposition, Langton decided to revise the existing divisions of the various books of the Bible. His new arrangement was adopted in the standard or Paris text, which the Paris masters accepted early in the thirteenth century, and it has descended from the Paris Bible to modern times. So it came about that Langton is responsible for the chapters which we use. As references are made to the old division in the exposition of the first three books of the Pentateuch and of part of Numbers, and to the new division in the exposition of the latter part of Numbers, it would seem that Langton decided upon his arrangement while he was lecturing upon the Pentateuch. The commentary on the Minor Prophets also uses the old divisions, so that, if the date 1203 is correct, and is not, as is quite likely, the date of some later copy, we could attribute the new division to the last three years of Langton's teaching in Paris. *

The commentaries were based upon lectures. Originally they were oral expositions. We know from later evidence that Langton would call attention to wrong readings in the Biblical text, and that his hearers would then correct their copies. He may thus have had his share in the production of the Paris Bible, afterwards severely criticized by Roger Bacon as a casual and capricious piece of revision. Some writers have supposed that he had a knowledge of Hebrew, but—though here I speak without any authority—I think it more likely that his acquaintance with critical and philosophical matters was confined to the "interpretations of Hebrew words" and other guides available to the scholar.† However this may be, his work upon

* This argument is very tentative, and should not be accepted as more than a suggestion until more work has been done on his commentaries.

† Works of this kind are also attributed to h'm.

the Scriptures is remarkable, not for scholarship or method, but for a strange mixture of shrewd commonsense and a fanciful exuberance in the moral style of exposition. It is the work of a practical, clear-sighted man, who was also a famous preacher, concerned with everyday problems; it is also the work of a man peculiarly sensitive to all the impressions, analogies, associations, however far-fetched or fantastic they might be, brought into his mind by the words of Scripture. The same qualities are found in his sermons, and, with less violence of contrast, in his most important writings, the general lectures or *questiones* on theological and moral subjects. One moment we hear the quiet, cool voice of the man of the world who sees things as they are: the next moment we are carried into that apparently chaotic region of fanciful lore which meets us in the bestiaries and encyclopædias on the nature of things. In a word, Langton was a man of his time. The same apparent contrast meets us in Roger Bacon and in Albert the Great. In another form it runs riot in the English literature of the seventeenth century. It is impossible to the educated man of to-day because he instinctively reduces phenomena to the principles of development and species; but it can still be found in the speech of unsophisticated peasants, and in less pleasant forms it is not unknown among the over-civilized.

We put barriers to our understanding of medieval thought if we imagine that because Langton and his colleagues had not our criteria for judgment, they were afflicted by any disorderliness of mind. The world, in their view, was made like that, full of a number of different things. The great fundamental principles of natural law—the things in which, as the guide of life, man has found well-being—were to be found in the Scriptures. What more natural, therefore than that the texts of Holy Writ should point to all sorts of truths helpful to man in his perplexities, or conversely, than that the teacher should see everywhere in these texts the divine enforcement of the lessons which he wished to drive home?

Let us glance at this English master, talking with his pupils in Paris about the Pentateuch and the Minor Prophets.* Many of us have been reading lately about the wandering scholars. Langton had no use for *them*. The Vulgate of Micah i. 13 reads: "The tumult of a chariot hath astonished the inhabitants of Lachis; it is the beginning of sin to the daughter of Sion."

* I am indebted for the passages which follow to Miss B. Smalley, who is working on Langton's commentaries, and who has permitted me to select examples from her transcripts. Father G. Lacombe has in preparation a study of the manuscripts of the commentaries, which fall into distinct types. A more general treatment of Langton's views on ecclesiastical questions, as revealed by his Lectures, may be found in my *Stephen Langton* (Oxford, 1928).

Lachis is the roving which is the beginning of sin to the monks and scholars who, when they should be engaged in study or contemplation, scour the streets and highways as vagabonds, paying no heed to the warning of Solomon: "Look not about thee in the ways of the city." The master has a responsibility for as well as towards his pupils. In the Jewish law we read (Exod. xxi. 35, 36), "And if one man's ox hurt another, that he die, then they shall sell the live ox and divide the money of it; and the dead ox also shall they divide. Or if it be known that the ox hath used to push in time past, and his owner hath not kept him in, he shall surely pay ox for ox; and the dead shall be his own." A master's quarrelsome pupil injures the pupil of another master. The two masters must combine together to do justice, dividing the price, each sympathizing with the injured, taking no side but behaving with charity. If, however, the first master was aware of his pupil's fault and had failed to correct him, he must strive with all his might to a restoration of the injured man to health and be responsible for the whole penalty; *error discipuli culpa est magistri.* The interpretation, or, rather, the explanation of a biblical text is frequently illustrated by some incident which the master has noted, or some tendency which perhaps he has had to check in himself. Thus the words of Hosea (ii. 12), "I will lay waste his vine," suggest of all things lax behaviour in church. Langton corrects the text. The vines are not destroyed, but damaged, as when a man, who goes habitually to church, gradually loses his reverence. As though he were at home, his thoughts during Mass dwell entirely on his studies or his business. His vineyard is damaged. But there can be vainglory in church. Amos (vi. 5) rebukes those who "chant to the sound of the viol and invent to themselves instruments of music like David." This, says Langton, is against those who sing Alleluia to the organ at Mass, on the pretext of devotion, for the sake of vainglory; as though they said they had the devotion of David, who humbly sang with musical instruments before the ark.* We remember that the future archbishop belonged to an austere school. His master, Peter, the cantor of Notre Dame, had been one of those who deplored the lavish scale and artistic luxury of the new cathedral. The cantor and his disciple were both interested in music. Langton possibly composed the sequence "Veni, sancte spiritus," while he was a canon of Notre Dame and teaching in the schools. His objection to the use of the organ during the long-drawn-out

* Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. 2. 26 f. 90r, comment on Amos vi. 5: "Hec contra illos qui specie deuocionis causa inanis glorie organice alleluia decantant in missa, tanquam se dicant habere deuccionem dauid coram archa musicis instrumentis humiliter decantantis. Sed non sic impii non sic." A similar passage appears in a commentary on Amos v. 23 (fo. 88r).

singing of the Alleluia between the Epistle and the Gospel is very interesting. As many passages in the liturgical works of the period show, the singing of the Alleluia was regarded as full of devotional significance.* In future years his own noble sequence was given a high place among the musical elaborations which developed out of it.

Langton looked much wider afield for his illustrations than to the occurrences of everyday life about him. He was concerned with the welfare of the Church as a whole, and especially with its wise administration by the prelates, and the recognition of its place in the world. He would denounce those who lessen the measures, "making the ephod small" (Amos viii. 5). These are men who have received wisdom in large measure from God, but who do not mete it out again, seldom deigning to preach. Their sermons to the rich are elegant and polished, but to the poor they preach bad, useless sermons, as though they are dragged out of them. Such men "sell the refuse of the wheat" (Amos viii. 6). There are certain men who are like Jonah, who had to undergo his experience in the whale's belly before he could preach to the Ninevites: before they sin they are unwilling to preach, but after being ensnared and then freed by grace, they willingly take the duty upon themselves. A comment upon Joel (i. 11), "Howl, O ye winedressers, for the wheat and for the barley," bearing on this theme, goes to confirm the conclusions reached by the late Sir William Ashley in his lectures on "The Bread of our Forefathers." Wheat, as Jerome says, is more precious, but barley is more fruitful and useful. Is not wheat the doctrine or preaching given to clergy and barley the preaching to the laity? The latter is coarser, but more fruitful and useful than the former. The criticisms of the prelates are still more vigorous. Langton was in the fashion—he said little that was new—but he had a more direct, pointed, practical intention than most of his fellow-critics. His observations are the words of an observant man of affairs, rather than the objurgations of the ill-balanced preacher. Prelates and men of letters rejoice at the death of an ecclesiastical dignitary, as the tribes of Judah rejoiced at the captivity of the ten; they hope for his office. Bishops are too inclined to seek pretexts for excommunicating priests, so that they may extort a palfrey or some such thing from them: they "sanctify war" (Micah iii. 5). Several times, in his work on the Minor Prophets, Langton turns to the story of King Ahaziah, who fell down through a lattice in his upper chamber that was in Samaria

* See the texts collected by Leon Gauthier, *Œuvres poetiques d'Adam de Saint Victor*, third edition, Paris, 1894, pp. 281, 282; on the use of the organ, *cf.* p. 305. I owe these references to Mr. W. A. Pantin.

(2 Kings i. 2). Samaria means "custodia," and Ahaziah signifies a prelate. The lattice windows, through which but little light enters, signify pastoral care in which is the dimness of perplexity. "Truly in our times very little or no light enters by them, and many prelates tumble out of the lattices." Prelates should be like the nail that comes out of Judah, the Church (Zech. x. 4). Nails are fixed on high in the tabernacle, where they support and spread out the curtains above the floor: so prelates in the Church are fixed on high, that by perseverance in good living they may keep their people from earthliness, supporting them by their example, by teaching and, if need be, by the giving of alms, and spreading them to their improvement. Langton returns again and again to the force of example, and to the duty of sustaining and encouraging the weak. The Church is in battle array, martyrs in the van, the fighters against anti-Christ in the rear, a great useless rabble in the middle. So in his famous sermon, preached in this place, on the translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury—his exemplar—he compares the translation to its new shrine of the saint's body to the illumination of the sun in the heavens. The monks who serve him, maintaining the rules of their order, are like the moon in her place, drawing light from the sun. And the saint is serviceable to the sinners of this world, for the sun when it has risen draws drops of the salt sea, to which sinners may rightly be compared, by reason both of the brevity and saltness of mortal life, and of the bitterness of their sins.*

To Langton, as to any good churchman of the reforming school, the subjection of the spiritual to the secular was anathema. He was not an extreme papalist. He would interpret and justify ecclesiastical claims, the necessity of unity, in the light of the moral obligations of the Church. He was a realist. Thus, after giving the view that the secular power depends upon the spiritual, as the moon receives light from the sun, he admits that the theory is open to question. The Church gives doctrine and faith; in that case, at all events, the parallel holds, but, in fact, the sun often suffers eclipse from the interposition of the moon. What angered Langton was the acquiescence of the clergy in an unworthy dependence upon secular lords. Princes are not wont to act like the King of Nineveh, who "rose from his throne and laid his robe from him and covered him with sackcloth and sat in ashes" (Jonah iii. 6). They

* J. A. Giles, "Vita S. Thomæ" in *Patres Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, xxxvii. (Oxford, 1845), pp. 296, 297. The whole address fills pp. 269-297. I have previously accepted the view that it was delivered on the actual occasion of the translation, July 7, 1220, but I am now disposed to think, from internal evidence, that it was preached to a congregation of Canterbury monks on a later anniversary of this ceremony.

approach the priest with an air of disdain, not humiliating themselves at his feet, but sitting beside him as though they would dispute with him. Prelates who take personal advantage of these secular claims do the Church dishonour. Langton, in a long passage, draws out a parallel between such men and Amaziah, the high priest of Bethel, who "sent to Jeroboam, King of Israel, saying, Amos has conspired against thee," and at the same time "said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there; but prophesy not again any more at Bethel; for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court" (Amos vii. 10, 12, 13). "There are ecclesiastics who will not move from their table to hear the confession of a poor man on his deathbed, though they will go two leagues or more on a winter's night for a harlot or for gain. To cancel their sin, they will accuse a good preacher of insulting the King, and if their report is not believed, will try to get rid of him: 'You teacher, who come from Paris, and threaten us with all your preaching, get out of my diocese, go back to Paris to your studies. . . . You do wrong to reprove the King, for this place is his and it is for him to choose the parsons of this church.' Bad prelates, indeed, are wont to say that they act upon the authority of Emperor or King. If they are resisted, they scold, saying, 'You are acting against the King or Emperor, for you despise his institutions.' So they flatter princes, that what they have done may seem to have been done by the princes."

If Langton had died as a master at Paris, these passages would have had their interest as criticisms of the life of his time: they have a more important significance as the revelation of the mind of a future cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury, who helped to shape events during a formative period. The commentaries, lectures, and sermons give us some idea of the principles which directed Langton's activities. They are very simple, direct, moral principles, naïve yet far-reaching. This was the man who rallied the magnates and judges of England to define the customs of English administrative life, the privileges of the various orders of society, the implications of the coronation oath; who tried to restore the Church in England to self-respect after the indignities and spoliation suffered during the Interdict, who asserted the customary rights of the English prelates even against the agents of the greatest of medieval popes; who afterwards supervised the reorganization of dioceses, and developed the provincial assembly or Convocation of Canterbury on a representative basis; and, finally, who used all the authority of the ecclesiastical arm to maintain the throne of the young king, Henry III. It is difficult, if not impossible, to discuss the

significance of Langton's views without a careful examination of the nature of society seven hundred years ago. A point which strikes us at first as odd, naïve, even childish, may become full of meaning in the light of feudal custom or ecclesiastical discipline. But, running the risk of anachronism, I will conclude with a brief summary, expressed so far as possible in general and modern terms, of the archbishop's opinions. They have no claim to originality save the originality which always belongs to opinions firmly held by a man who is strong and clear-sighted enough to act upon them: but they may appear to be not altogether irrelevant to present problems and discontents.

All men are subject to the law of nature, whose precepts are revealed in the Scriptures. Every power is subject to it, so that neither pope nor kings can disregard it. Christ is the head of the Church, but the pope is His mouthpiece, and only the event can show how far papal authority, deliberately expressed with the counsel and consent of his cardinals, can extend, for who resists him resists the ordinance of God. He is the exponent of the moral law, and when he has spoken his decree must be observed, though it may surprise us and be contrary to our own teaching. In other words, the judgment of the Church is not arbitrary. Just as it is the duty of teachers to discuss the bearing of the moral law, so it is the function of the authority, where necessary, to close an issue. The prince is in a different position. He also is subject to the law, both the law of the community, so far as it is in accordance with the law of nature, and this law of nature or moral law, but the princes of the Church, as the exponents of the latter, can declare that he has failed to observe it. In feudal terms, if a prince fails in his allegiance to God, his overlord, his subjects must recognize the higher claims of the overlord. They must not use their own discretion. They must obey even an unjust judgment if it is made in the King's court—that is to say, formally decreed by the King and his counsellors—but they need not obey an unjust command which has not this sanction. In modern terms, there is no absolute or state sovereignty. Secular government is part of the divine order, and has its own law subject to the moral law, but it is not the final judge of this moral law, any more than the executive is the judge of lawful custom. The phrase "a state Church" would have been meaningless to Langton; but so also would have been the idea, so often expressed nowadays, that the Church has no responsibility in matters of state. All human activities are subject to God's ordinances. This, however we express it, is the main lesson which the modern can learn from the medieval world.

The responsibility of the Church, and especially of prelates,

is all the greater because their privileges are great. Ambition is natural in a prince, but a sin in a prelate. The clergy, either singly or as corporations, have a proprietary right in the goods which they enjoy, but their trust is all the greater. They cannot isolate its use from the welfare of the community in which they live. If a prince is in real need in a just cause, they should help him freely, although he has no *right* to tax spiritual property. If the poor are in need, they must be nourished. Everything is a trust, and in many ways the laity have more claim than the clergy. There are some things which the clergy should not reveal to the laity, but it is a finer and more useful thing to minister to the laity, to spend oneself upon them, in preaching and visitation, than to occupy onself with fellow-clergy. At present the Church is largely a rabble, but we must hope and work.

The appointment of good prelates is vital. Everything turns on that. To appoint to a bishopric a recluse, a contemplative, who has his own proper vocation, is rarely wise. A prelate must be sagacious, experienced, learned if possible, and absolutely disinterested. He must not regard his diocese as a vested interest, protected by the power of the world, but must give a welcome to all good teaching. (Langton, it may be remarked, had been in Rome when St. Francis was causing a stir, and had, like St. Dominic, preached against heresy in France. He welcomed the two mendicant orders when they sent their mission to England.) Nothing is too minute for the attention of a good prelate and priest, but some things are indifferent and many things are unknown or insoluble. Anything in conduct, as in ritual, which suggests vainglory and show is bad; so is idle wandering and fussiness. The teacher has the right to explore unsettled questions and the duty to discuss the minutiæ of moral and pastoral theology. We must face things as they are and use our commonsense, and not be afraid to say that we do not know. There is no room for pedantry. Obedience is due to authority: but conscience has its rights, for—as I understand Langton—a wise superior will explain why an order is given, and this gives the subordinate an opportunity, under certain circumstances, to exercise his judgment. Thus if a canon with no obligation to reside is studying in the schools, and is ordered to return by his bishop, he must return if the intention is to strengthen the chapter; but if the order is given in his own interest he has a right to assert his view. If Langton, as archbishop, acted in the spirit of his early teaching, he must have been an enlightened as well as a firm disciplinarian. As primate he thought that the constituted authorities should, so far as possible, be left to manage the affairs of the Church of England

with the aid of the local clergy. He was always prepared to reason with the pope, just as in the end he would, if he could not carry his point, obey. It was said during some recent discussions "it was not inconceivable that the Sovereign Pontiff might allow that normally the local authority should work without his intervention." In the thirteenth century the pope intervened daily. Appeals to Rome were almost a matter of course. But, Langton believed, there was no need to send in legates and promote foreigners.

Langton is a vague figure; but one seems to see through the mist an austere, just, hard-working, very observant and understanding man. Full of curiosity, he never lost his balance. A good talker among his friends, a helpful, stimulating teacher. As a statesman and prelate, a man who went straight to the mark, yet took endless pains. Impatient of disorder and extravagance in conduct, he believed that everyone had his place, and that self-surrender to duty was the way to peace, a rational cheerfulness in obedience the safeguard of a true inner freedom. He was one of those strong, humble souls who do not appeal to the imagination, though they win the respect, of men, because they have deliberately subdued the spirit of adventure in themselves, and directed all their energy to making the place they live in more orderly and efficient. That is one side of the archbishop. There is another side, less clear to us—the student who could lose himself so easily in the intricacies of fanciful speculation, the man who brooded over the problem of penitence, the priest who liked to think of Crusaders and Templars and the contemplatives of the cloister, the ecclesiastic who could strike hard and fiercely when occasion arose. And binding together both the clear-headed man of affairs and the self-imprisoned adventurer was the power of conviction: the deliberate belief, denied the personal certainty of a mystical experience, in the futility of man unless he has thrown in his lot with God, the sense of the unfathomable in God and the reliance upon the consoling presence, the Spirit of God:

In labore requies
In æstu temperies
In fletu solatium.

Sine tuo numine
Nihil est in homine
Nihil est innoxium.

F. M. Powicke.

THE PRIEST IN HIS CHURCH*

I

If I were asked to advise a priest preparing to become a village rector, I would suggest first that he should make a good retreat of not less than three days; and then that he should make a careful study of Thomas Hardy's novels. From the retreat he would learn in what spirit to undertake his work. "It is certain," says Lallemant, "that a man of prayer will do more in a year than another in all his life." He would make his confession, and there is no preparation for a new enterprise so good as a thorough purification of the conscience. From Thomas Hardy he would learn the essential dignity of country people, and what deep and often passionate interest belongs to every individual life. You cannot treat them in the mass: each single soul is to be the object of your special and peculiar care.

I would have a priest in such circumstances thank God that he is called to so pleasant and happy a task. He is given a job he can tackle: no very big or exacting work, but yet one which will provide a field for all he can do. You need no great gifts to be a village priest: you need not be a fine scholar or a magnificent orator or a bustling man of affairs: it is enough if you are humble and sincere and cheerful and loving and gentle. You should have a sense of humour and the patience which is content to wait: and there is no grace for which the countryman has more respect than the courage which is never daunted, and the pluck which never gives in. A villager expects his priest to be a gentleman; that does not mean that he is rich or bumptious or overbearing, but that he is sure of himself, and makes no empty pretensions, and treats all alike with the same quiet and delicate consideration. You must never take liberties with countryfolk: it is best to treat them with rather ceremonious politeness. When you cannot call a man Fred or Jim, I think there is much to be said for calling him "Mister." If you are very careful never to take liberties, one of the joys of your life will be the beautiful courtesy you will invariably meet with in return. If you are proud of your parish and your people, they will never fail you: they will always take your part, whatever those strange foreigners—the people in the next village over the hill—may say about you.

* A paper read at the Priests' Convention held at Salisbury, May 29, 1928.

II

When you begin your work in a new parish, please expect the best of everybody. If you hope for nothing, that is what you will get. If the squire is inclined to be suspicious of the "high church," it is your business to convert him. The farmers and the labourers have at any rate a respect for the Bible, and it is your business to show that the Church is but the apparatus by which the Gospel is made contemporary, by which the ministries of the Gospel are brought into touch with human need today. The name of Jesus is known and loved in our little villages: the whole work of the Church is but to bring Jesus near. Use the old foundations: build on what you find.

What should be the first steps of a new rector on appointment to his parish?

I do not doubt that for a few months he must carry on the existing arrangements. He should be friends with his flock before he can safely venture on important changes. But he must from the first have his mind made up as to what he wants. He must be clear that the way of the Church—the Church from the first, the Church universal—is to be his guide. For instance, the breaking of the bread was the central worship of the faithful in the days of the Apostles, and always and everywhere afterwards; then surely the breaking of the bread must be, sooner or later, the central worship in this particular parish.

At once on his arrival the new rector will begin to say the daily offices in church, early in the morning, at seven or seven-thirty, so that the men may hear the bell as they go to work; and again in the evening. Of course, he will celebrate the Holy Communion with the utmost effort for devotion and recollection, and that will be much more persuasive than many sermons. Soon it will get to be known in the village that even if the celebration is after Mattins, the new clergyman is always strictly fasting. There are a good many parishes, I think, where no offence would be given if the two candles were lighted on the altar, and white silk vestments and wafer bread were used on the first Sunday after the new rector's induction. I have never known villagers object to unobtrusive vestments.

The new priest should try hard to preach as well as he can, to interest and inspire his people; of course, he should visit every house as soon as possible, and teach the children nearly every morning in the school. After a few months, if he has succeeded in increasing the congregation, and has met with a friendly reception in the parish, he may venture on the first decisive changes. At some quiet time in the year, after careful instruction (given, however, with much effort not to charge

the atmosphere with tragedy and suspicion), he will substitute on one or more Sundays of the month the Litany and the Communion service for the customary Mattins and sermon. This combination was suggested by Bishop Wilberforce in his charge of 1866. It makes an excellent service. The Litany is the proper prelude to the Mass, and no feature in the Prayer Book is more loved by old-fashioned churchpeople. The alb and stole are used for the Litany, and the minister puts on a chasuble during the hymn that follows. The priest should do his best to make the service attractive. The bells must be rung: he will preach as well as he can for ten or fifteen minutes: most important of all, the service must be over within the hour. There should be two servers, the boys, if they can be got, of influential parishioners. The simple ritual should be very carefully planned: the preparation, the moving of the book, the offertory ceremonies, the ablutions. The big bell in the tower will be rung to announce the consecration to the sick: this may be done long before it will be prudent to tinkle the hand-bell at the altar. It is very important to choose good and familiar hymns: an introductory hymn like "Veni, Creator" for the introit, a short hymn for the offertory, "Tantum ergo" or "O salutaris" after the consecration, a sound and cheerful hymn after the blessing. The responses to the commandments should be said; the ancient mediæval tune for the Creed may always be used; the priest should sing "Sursum corda" and the preface; and easy plainsong for the "Sanctus" and "Agnus Dei" is provided by Croft.

What shall be done about communicants? Mass should be said at seven or eight on every Sunday, and we should be very ready to give communion from the reserved Sacrament to such people as milkers, policemen, and footmen who cannot possibly attend at a service. When the need for communion is thus fully met, I think that the conditions of modern life and the allowance of the Church permit that only the priest shall receive at the sung Mass on Sunday; it is so important to keep the service short, and to encourage the reverent way of receiving communion fasting. We should, of course, often remind our people that the ideal for every Sunday is a single service of sacrifice and communion, at which everyone present, including the children, receives the body and blood of the Lord.

The aim of the priest is that the communion service should be the chief service on all Sundays of the year. Varying services on varying Sundays always mean confusion and irritation. Attempts to cater for Protestants and Catholics in this way stereotype and crystallize differences which otherwise tend to die away. When exactly you can inaugurate this fixed arrange-

ment depends upon the circumstances of the parish. But some day, sooner rather than later, you must do so.

Evensong should be on a lower scale than the Mass. The bells should not be rung unless they have been rung for the morning service. Incense and processions and copes are quite out of place even on great festivals, unless ceremonial has become so familiar that nobody much notices it. Evensong may well end with a hymn sung kneeling, in recognition of our Lord's presence in the reserved Sacrament.

So soon as the priest has gained the confidence of the children, he should arrange for them to attend Mass on holy days in church instead of receiving a religious lesson in school. The service will be at nine: the music as on Sundays: the servers will be chosen from among the children: incense may be used (perhaps only at the introit) almost from the start. Parishioners who desire to communicate at this service should be encouraged to do so.

A daily Mass is possible in most country parishes. The priest should arrange with various people of goodwill to ensure a congregation on various mornings of the week, and before long there should be a few very frequent if not daily communicants.

Lent is an important opportunity. On one night of the week there should be a very simple mission service in the nave, with the chancel unlighted, and no ceremonial at all. There should be a good course of instruction at this service. I think it is well to suggest attendance at Sunday Evensong during Lent to those who generally attend only at the Eucharist.

III

From time to time in the novels of Dickens* you come upon a description of a country church: a chill, damp place, pervaded by a peculiar corpse-like, earthy smell, everything within—the worm-eaten books, the mouldering baize, the seats worn spare and yellow, the frayed bell-rope—telling of quiet, slow decay. It was not that he did not love the "shady, ancient, solemn little churches," but he seems to have thought of them as picturesque but pitiful and forlorn survivals from a different age when churches served a practical and living purpose.

We know now, as Dr. Dearmer has said, that in his time the ancient features were almost intact. "They cannot be brought back now. It is the difference between an old lady, wrinkled and grey, but still beautiful, and one who has put on a

* *The Old Curiosity Shop*, chap. xvii.; *Bleak House*, chaps. ii., xii., xviii.

brown wig and enamelled her skin."* We must do our best with what is left after the well-meaning but mistaken restorations of the Victorian age.

What advice should be given to a new incumbent who finds himself in charge of a mediæval church, the furniture of which is depressing and unsatisfactory and uncatholic?

I suggest that he shall invest at once a few pence in the three reports of the Central Council for the Care of Churches,† and the York Minster historical tract, by the Dean of Westminster, on decoration and enrichment in Cathedrals.‡ I suggest also that if it is at all possible he shall secure the services of a first-rate architect, who has proved himself to possess the rare capacity of dealing adequately with the decoration of ancient churches. Here are some mistakes to be avoided.

1. The introduction of a surpliced choir, and the consequent crowding of the chancel with seats and desks. The chancel ought to be kept as empty as possible, and the choir should be in a west gallery with the organ.

2. The hasty purchase from an ecclesiastical shop of cheap brass goods, such as candlesticks, cross, desks, curtain rods with decorated ends. It is a good rule to have no brass in a church except such chandeliers for candles as you may see in the Abbey Church of Westminster.

3. And do not set the pious amateurs of the parish to work on a new oak screen. The effect of new, raw oak, unpainted and ungilt, is always dismal and depressing.

4. You may easily give great offence by the hasty erection of cheap, bright pictures, and, in a less degree, by setting a tabernacle at once on the high altar. When reservation is begun, it should be in very unobtrusive fashion.

The furnishing of an ancient church is a very responsible and difficult and delicate business. If the priest is rich, he should spend a good deal of money on his church before he provides more than the simplest necessaries for his house. If he is poor, he must be careful to get the best value for every penny he can afford to give.

Each detail must be very carefully considered. What is done now concerns future generations of churchfolk. And each detail must be considered in relation to the entire building. A window or picture or frontal is only valuable in so far as it improves the look of the church as a whole.

The Church is at once unified and vastly improved if all the walls, all new stonework, and the tracery of the windows are

* *The Art of Public Worship*, p. 36.

† Published by the Press Board of the Church Assembly. ‡ S.P.C.K.

whitened. I have heard Mr. Comper say that ordinary white-wash, made with lime in a bucket, is better than distemper.

The next step is to get the altar satisfactory. The church will never look happy until you have the altar of a size in right proportion to the whole, and this is a matter for an architect to arrange.* The existing altar can be enlarged by the village carpenter; three linen cloths for the mensa must be provided, of which one will fall to the ground on either side; and when you have set a crucifix and two candlesticks not less than 18 inches high directly on the altar you have done what is most immediately necessary. The cross and candlesticks may be of gilded wood, if you cannot afford silver. The footpace in front of the altar must be at least 3 ft. 6 ins. wide. Flowers are best in groups on the floor on either side.

You will improve the altar if you spread before it a Persian rug which would otherwise be in your study, and if you can afford to make it magnificent, employ the village carpenter to produce four oak pillars from an architect's design, to set at the four corners of the altar, and hang rose-coloured silk curtains between them below the east window and at the two sides. The curtain at the back is best hanging stiff, and those at the sides in folds. Gilt angels holding tapers may be set on the pillars, and the pillars themselves should be painted and gilt. A frontal of flowered tapestry with a cheerful fringe will look well against the rose-coloured dorsal, and will serve for all occasions until you can buy ornaments for the several seasons of the year. It is very important that the ornaments for each occasion should be *en suite*. The frontal and dorsal should either be in carefully planned contrast or of the same colour and material. A litany desk at the entrance to the chancel becomes a pleasant feature if you cover it with a fringed cloth of the same material as the frontal, reaching to the ground on either side. The altar book should rest on a cushion or a desk, covered with the same silk as the frontal. It is much better to provide one or two good sets of ornaments—complete with frontal, dorsal, riddels, vestments and hangings, which will last for fifty years, than to spend money on the accumulation of ill-assorted odds and ends.

Our small chancels were not built to have communion rails, and those we find are generally too near the altar. Rails of the usual modern type should be taken away, and communion desks with linen cloths substituted for them: these desks should be movable, and need only be in place before the altar when a Mass with communicants is being said. Com-

* The altar in my small church is 3 feet 6 inches high and 7 feet 6 inches long; the mensa is 3 feet 3 inches wide.

munion rails of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are so charming that, of course, they must remain, and other arrangements be adjusted to them.

There is no need for a lectern: the lessons can be read from the rector's stall in the choir. An expensive stone pulpit is generally a hideous disfigurement in a church; a plain pulpit of wood looks best, and a crimson velvet cushion with great hanging tassels and a large Bible furnish it well, and are very convenient for the preacher.

A fine window over the high altar is the ideal reredos for a mediæval church, but the side-windows may well be filled with plain glass through which the trees may be seen. A small church looks charming when lighted up with candles throughout. The cost need not be more than £7 or £8 a year. Lamps should never be used.

The font should be only less splendid than the altar. It should always have a cover, and if this is painted and gilt, it may be one of the most beautiful features of the church.

Solemn and religious pictures, each very carefully chosen, and not very many of them, help to produce an atmosphere of devotion, and with gilt and decorated frames, look lovely on the white walls.

I think that the blessed Sacrament is best reserved in a hanging pyx above the high altar. This was the usual mediæval practice in England, and has been restored in the cathedral church of Truro. The old-fashioned Roman Catholic who published *Voyages liturgiques de France* in 1718 describes many aumbries for reservation as still existing in his time, and if we are required to use this method, the aumbry should be in the north wall of the sanctuary with a veil over the door, and a lamp with a white glass hanging somewhere near.

The other day I found one of my most faithful parishioners exhibiting our church to a friend, the wife of a plumber in the next village. I was delighted to hear her explain the value of the reserved Sacrament, as not less necessary for the sudden emergencies of sickness in the villages than in the towns. Her friend remarked on the splendid gifts which the squire had made to the church in her own parish. "Oh," she said, "but ours is a one-man church." This is a good hint with which to conclude. If you want the parishioners to love their church, you must invite each and all to help to make it beautiful. Great gifts should come from the rich, little gifts from the poor; but each in the sight of God will be worth just what it represents in sacrifice and devotion.

J. F. BRISCOE.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

OFFICIAL news of the Archbishop of Canterbury's resignation and of his successor's appointment has been issued as this number goes to press. We shall hope to publish in the autumn some appreciation of Dr. Davidson's tenure of the primacy. Meanwhile, we believe, our readers will have read with deep satisfaction of the choice of Dr. Lang to succeed him.

The Rev. C. T. Harley Walker, whose instructive review of Dr. Brilioth's big work on the Eucharist we publish below, is Chaplain at Bucharest. Dr. Brilioth is already well known to many of our readers as the author of a penetrating study of the Oxford Movement entitled *The Anglican Revival*.

VERSE

THE CHOICE

FOR THE FEAST OF THE TRANSFIGURATION AFTER WHICH OUR LORD "STEDFASTLY SET HIS FACE TO GO TO JERUSALEM."

Was ever greater wonder seen of mortals?
Messiah, King of kings, is glorified:
With lifted heads the everlasting portals
Beckon the Word back to His Father's side.

But who are these that lie beside Him sleeping,
So slow of heart? Why has He chosen them?
Could they, with Him the flood of death o'erleaping,
Straightway attain the New Jerusalem?

Their weight of sin forbids: but see! His pity
Discerns athwart the sundering straits a ford,
A harder passage to the Heavenly City,
Yet one His folk may traverse with their Lord.

J. S. MACARTHUR.

NOTE

Yngve Brilioth. *Nattvarden i Evangeliskt Gudstjänstliv*. 15 Kronor. Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag. Stockholm.

Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift, 1926. 10 Kronor. Almquist och Wiksell. Uppsala och Stockholm.

The high standard of work which has marked recent Swedish theological literature is fully maintained in Dr. Brilioth's present volume on the Lord's Supper. Besides covering a good deal of ground which is familiar to the British reader and to liturgiologists in general, it embraces

a good deal which is less well known. And it will probably be even still more fresh and suggestive to Swedish than to foreign readers. Indeed, it would be difficult to find in any language a work with quite the same scope. Dr. Brilioth's command of his material is equalled by his skill and judgment in handling it. He combines penetrative analysis with a clear grasp of the main point, caution with decision, incisiveness with balance. While summarizing the results of previous investigation, he suggests lines of further study. The fine scholarship and attractive style of the book tempt a reviewer to quote extensively. The spirit in which it is written is admirable, befitting the subject. And all the special knowledge of the Church historian and liturgiologist is brought to bear on the practical problems of Church life in the present day.

The book contains 488 pages and is divided into eight chapters. It discusses the present position of the Eucharist in Evangelical Christendom in the light of general Church history and comparative liturgiology. The chapters are headed as follows: I. The Eucharist and the Gospel; II. The Chief Points in the Celebration of the Eucharist in the Early Church; III. The Eucharist in the Roman Medieval Church; IV. The Lutheran Line; V. The Reformed Line; VI. The Anglican Line; VII. The Eucharist in the Swedish Reformation; VIII. The Eucharist in Swedish Church Life at the Present Time.

In the first chapter there is a summary of recent critical work on the New Testament references to the Eucharist. In the second the significance of the Eucharist in the early Church is considered under five headings: (1) Thanksgiving, (2) Fellowship, (3) Commemoration, (4) Sacrifice, (5) Mystery. In the rest of the book the development of these ideas is traced in the subsequent history of Christendom. The author shows how difficult it has been found to preserve them all in their integrity. Thus the conception of the greatest Christian rite has always tended to become defective in one way or another. One side of it has been over-emphasized to the detriment of another. Something has been lost of its primitive richness. The Reformation was a violent reaction against a certain kind of distortion of the meaning of the Sacrament, but a reaction that went to the extreme of one-sided development in opposite directions. Or, again, when a certain aspect of the Eucharist has lapsed for a time, it has sometimes reasserted itself and returned in another form. Each of the five aspects or fundamental ideas has a New Testament basis, and each of them has been differently realized at different times and differently conceived by different minds. There are manifold gradations of depth and richness in the mode of their realization. On these lines Dr. Brilioth finds both a liturgical criterion and a basis for practical suggestion.

A few quotations may be here in place to illustrate his method:

"It is certainly not a coincidence that the Pauline presentation lays a stronger emphasis than the Synoptic on the memory of the Lord's death; but it has already been observed that it is not St. Paul who first brought this memory into connection with the sacred repast. . . . St. John's Gospel in particular offers a singular contrast therewith; it is certainly an exaggeration to deny with Reville that any connection whatever existed for the fourth evangelist between the Eucharist and the death of Jesus—all talk of eating His flesh and drinking His blood would be meaningless without Golgotha being therewith understood as a background. And the character of the Saviour, whose presence the evangelist

again comes to experience in virtue of the Eucharist, certainly owes to memory at least its outer contours—but it is unmistakably clear, *for one thing*, that the cross in this connection stood more in the background than it does with St. Paul; *for another*, that actual commemoration, the historical element, had less significance in the Johannine world of ideas than in the Synoptic" (p. 69). "Perhaps it may be said that the 'moment' of commemoration in the Mass of the Faithful shows a certain tendency to become weaker, in the same proportion as the central thought of the crucifixion and redemption through Christ attained greater prominence, not as a historical fact, but as a present reality. If we are justified in treating the Clementine liturgy as representing an older type in comparison with other developed liturgies, such is evidently the case" (p. 78). "To sunder the Eucharist from every connection with the ideas of sacrifice, which throughout the history of the Church have been associated with it, would entail a real loss, a lessening in the Eucharist's religious tension. The way to preserve the evangelical fullness of the content of the Eucharist is not that of puritan reduction. At every point there lurks the danger that sub-Christian ideas may prevail—they succeed most easily when they find an isolated 'moment' to attack. The effective defence against their attack consists in the preservation of the various 'moments'' completeness and mutual harmony" (pp. 89, 90). "Not without reason has one of the men of the Benedictine cult-reform described the mystery religions as 'die Vorschule Christi' (Casel, *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier*). But to this must be added a double reservation. On the one side, what we have to do with in the mystery religions is not a single, easily comprehensible phenomenon—on the contrary, it is only motley flotsam and jetsam from a comprehensive and heterogeneous cargo that research has succeeded in rescuing; here it needs an effort to distinguish how, to a certain extent, unified religious forces worked to gain from this fluctuating material higher spiritual values. On the other side, it is impossible to define the limits for this transformation process, in which there is no doubt that the essential factors come from the East: in other words, we have no fixed starting points for defining the limits between what has its true home in the Gospel's 'own' world and what ought properly, in the end, to be referred to the sphere of Hellenistic syncretism. But for a positive view regarding the history of revelation such a delimitation of territory is by no means necessary either" (p. 95).

On p. 97 he points out that the fundamental difference between Christianity and the mystery religions is the "difference between myth and history." "Without afresh entering into the complex of problems which are connected with the interpretation of the words of institution, one might perhaps venture to characterize the mystery which is contained in these narratives in the following propositions: (1) In the supper there is an experience of the Lord's presence and of fellowship with Him. (2) This presence is connected with the bread and wine and determined by the use which Jesus Himself made of these elements at His Last Supper. (3) A real identification between bread and wine and Jesus' material flesh and blood is rendered impossible by the situation presupposed by the narrative—Jesus sits still alive in the circle of His followers; the words would have been then unintelligible in this signification (apart from the repugnance for Jewish thought in drinking real blood); finally we must remember that the copula (*est*, is) in which during the later Eucharistic controversies it has been sought to find an expression for a real identifica-

tion certainly did not exist in the Aramaic form of the words; but just the form which the words had to take when translated into other languages has contributed to the localizing of the sacred presence in the elements. (4) Whereas the Lord's presence is yet attached to the elements, these are designed to represent vividly in the repeated rite the significance of Jesus' own symbolical action—His self-outpouring in death; the elements guarantee accordingly the connection of the rite not only with the historical form of the Redeemer, but with His life's work completed on the cross. (5) The eating and drinking must therefore be the expression of the appropriation of the fullness of His being and of the fruit of His life's work" (p. 101). "Like the early Church, we have received from the Gospel the formula which continually is the sign of the mystery of the Lord's Supper: the Lord's presence, connected with bread and wine, tokens of His suffering and death. Holding firmly to these, we ought to learn from the early Church to abstain from seeking definitions which can never exhaust the fullness of the religious experience. The real presence is a value in the true world of faith, where it alone is supreme: therein is actualized, as in no other way, the central religious experience of Christianity, the meeting and union of the faithful with their Lord, identical with the historical Jesus, unhindered by time and space. But it lies in the nature of the value of faith that it is apprehended by faith not as its own subjective creation, but as a fact of objective character in the highest sense of the term. The value of the holy rite for faith must therefore depend on Jesus' own action, on the connection with His historical person, on the fact that it is an authentic expression for the vital force which He introduced into history. It therefore need never be apprehensive of the result of careful investigation. The history of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the early Church can also teach us the essential guarantees against its degradation to a subevangelical level. Foremost among these stands the preservation of the synoptic mystery type" (pp. 121, 122).

The transition to the medieval Church of the West is made as follows: "The Church of the Middle Ages received from that of antiquity a rich heritage, but one full of contradiction. Deepest lies the tension between the two poles, which we have already noticed in the account of the Lord's Supper in the Gospel: the 'moment' of showing forth and that of partaking. These had been more definitely particularized on the one side in connection with the synoptic type of mystery, around which the thoughts of sacrifice had grouped themselves, and on the other side with the Johannine, the mysticism of which—in spite of the prayer for unity in the seventeenth chapter—has an individualistic character, which threatens to rob the sacred repast of its original mark of fellowship and directs the thoughts to the infusion of the Divine nature associated with the elements instead. This opposition is not covered by the ideas of sacrifice and mystery; for as soon as the thought of sacrifice attains any degree of realism, it passes on into the sphere of mystery. . . . To this dualism was added a second; in contrast with the massive realism of the popular belief, both in reference to sacrifice and to the indwelling sanctity of the elements, stood the effort of theological speculation to penetrate beyond to a more spiritual conception" (p. 123). The author goes on to trace in detail the doctrinal and liturgical developments in regard to the Eucharist in the West. The proportion of variable to invariable elements in the Mass is greater than in the East. The Roman Mass, with its genius for concise lapidary collects, and above all with its cumbrous and obscure canon, takes precedence

of alternative forms. The idea of sacrifice attains an unparalleled and disproportionate prominence. The thoughts of thanksgiving and fellowship are obscured. The thought of commemoration is accentuated in the elaboration of the representation of the liturgical year. The mystery of the Mass is almost exclusively concentrated in the conception of a localized presence in the elements through the dogma of Transubstantiation. Quite an evangelical spirit prevails in some of the commentaries on the Mass. The reception of the Sacrament in, *e.g.*, the *De Imitatione* is conceived predominantly in a spirit of personal mysticism. Finally, "the close connection between Eucharist and penance, the ethical qualifying of mystery, which was therein expressed, certainly constitutes the most important positive contribution of the medieval Church to the development of the Eucharist in doctrine and practice. It has brought to expression in fuller tone an essential feature in the Gospel account of the Eucharist, which the early Church underestimated, and thereby also left a significant heritage to succeeding ages. But the connection between the institution of penance and Church discipline implies all the same a risk that the service of the Gospel may come under the slavery of the law" (pp. 157, 158).

The Lutheran line of development is characterized by conservatism, traditional features being maintained, as a rule, when susceptible of an evangelical interpretation. Dr. Brilioth finds Luther at his best when he was least preoccupied with polemic—*e.g.*, in 1518 in the sermon *De digna præparatione cordis pro suscipiendo sacramento eucharistiæ*, and in 1519 in *Ein Sermon von dem hochwärdigen Sacrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften*. In these writings the thought of fellowship predominates. "Christ and the saints approach thee with all their virtues, their suffering and their grace, to live, act, endure, suffer, and die with thee, and will be wholly thine and have all in common with thee." So Luther encourages the faithful communicant. Thus Pauline and Augustinian ideas, long forgotten, become again prominent. In the later writings of Luther the main preoccupation is a double-fronted polemic against the medieval view of the sacrifice of the Mass on the one side and against Zwingli's rationalistic repudiation of the mystery on the other. The fundamental problem for the Lutheran cult was to transform the medieval Mass into an evangelical service, and to determine the claims of sermon and sacrament to form the centre of the chief Sunday service (pp. 203, 204). Unfortunately the only model available for Lutheran liturgiologists was the medieval Latin Mass. And they were unable to correct it by borrowing suggestions from older forms of service (p. 205). "In the liturgical life of the Middle Ages the two principal 'moments' of the Lord's Supper, that of participation and that of showing forth, had come to be sharply separated; as far as there was competition between them, that of showing forth prevailed. It was the task of the Lutheran reformation, as far as it had the power, to re-establish the evangelical unity of the two moments" (p. 216). In the later developments of Lutheranism the benefit of communion comes to be viewed too exclusively as the assurance of forgiveness, so that the Eucharist seems to be only a repetition of penance; thanksgiving and fellowship are overlooked; much of the depth and richness of Luther's own sacramental teaching is forgotten. In liturgical practice pietism and rationalism, helped by "reformed" influences, tend to an increasing impoverishment and decline. And modern attempts at liturgical revival and reform have not

always been on sound lines. Among the strong points of the Lutheran tradition are the insistence on the instruction of communicants and the wealth of fine hymns. Luther failed to find any reference to the Eucharist in St. John vi.

The Reformed line of development, like the Lutheran, rejected the medieval sacrifice of the Mass. But its whole tendency was more radical. The rationalism of Zwingli repudiated mystery as well as sacrifice, and in its cold deism quite missed the significance of the Incarnation. But although thereby it failed to take account of the deepest moments in the Lord's Supper, it did find expression for fellowship and thanksgiving. Calvin to some extent mediates between Zwingli and Luther. For he had a deep sense of the mystery of the sacrament and the reality of the sacramental gift, no less than Luther; but, like Zwingli, he stressed the transcendence of God to the exclusion of all ideas of immanence. Among the Reformed the liturgical year is greatly reduced.

Calvin's radical repudiation of medieval traditions may be explained by the fact that, unlike Luther and Zwingli, he had never been a priest.

Dr. Brilioth concludes his section on the Reformed line of development or group by pointing out that though the Reformed section has tended to ignore in its services the deeper aspects of the Eucharist, nevertheless they do give adequate recognition to other aspects which are elsewhere obscured. Hence the Reformed rite serves as a corrective to the Lutheran tone of penitence and heavy individualism.

In his section on our own communion the author shows the familiarity with our conditions which is to be expected from him, and a clear sense of the distinctiveness of the Anglican genius. He finds in the wide divergence between theory and practice a source alike of richness and of weakness in our position. With regard to doctrine he notes that "the English Church has never directly repudiated other views than on the one side transubstantiation, on the other side pure Zwinglianism" (p. 337). Two other characterizations are worth quoting: "Rarely within evangelical Christendom has the feature of showing forth in the service of the Lord's Supper been grasped and expressed so clearly, and at the same time in so purely an evangelical spirit, as in Andrewes." "Laud's importance consists principally in the fact that he translated into the cult the sacramental view, which found in Andrewes its most prominent exponent" (pp. 338, 339). He notes as a strong point in the English as opposed to the Swedish rite that ordination is maintained within the traditional framework of the Eucharist.

The last two chapters contain a useful account of the history of the Swedish rite and some valuable suggestions with regard to modern Swedish Church problems. The Reformation in Sweden was effected very gradually and carefully, and in a conservative spirit, without the violence of revolution or reaction. The services were not changed until the ground had been well prepared by a long course of evangelical preaching. There was a transition period, in which the service was partly in Latin, partly in Swedish. It is suggested that the Swedish form began with sick communion, was then extended to the Low Mass, and then last of all to the High Mass. The Catholicizing Liturgy of John III. had merits; but it was proposed at an inopportune time and in an inopportune manner, so that it never had a fair chance. As in England the experiment of enforcing communion as a qualification for civil rights was tried, with disastrous results to the spiritual life of the people. There is an interesting sugges-

tion on p. 457 that in the custom of having two priests to officiate at the altar on solemn occasions there is a survival of the deacon at High Mass. In modern times there has been a serious decline in Communion, only partly compensated by improvement or the maintenance of a high level in certain sections of Church life. "No one can measure what has been lost in self-examination, depth, and experience of God for the countless Swedish Christians in our generation, who have not been familiarized with communion as a normal factor in a Christian's practice, whose inner life has not found, through regular communion, its stimulating and life-giving rhythm. For the Church's liturgical life the decline of communion signifies the destruction of the classical form of Christian service. Together with traditional æsthetic values of mostly unimagined depth, the service has lost its centre of consecration, common prayer has lost its natural focus. The tyranny of the spoken word, only to a limited extent restrained by its liturgical setting in the Mass of the Catechumens, has banished the vivid *actio* of the cult, has permitted the frequently subjective exposition of the Word to be entirely substituted for the objective word of the sacrament, has made a slack passivity to be the natural attitude of the worshipper. But with the practice of Communion the thought of the Church too has lost an irreplaceable incentive to the continual fresh sounding of depths which the plumb of thought can never measure, but which Christian theology can never avoid traversing without paying the penalty. In the last resort the issue involved is whether the Christian view of God is to preserve its 'tense unity of immanence and transcendence.' The best guarantee for this is a sacramental devotion in an evangelical spirit. In reformed communities the eucharistic practice seems to be moving towards overcoming the original narrowness of the conception of God. It sometimes has appeared as if in the Lutheran Church of Sweden the decline of the sacrament would go hand in hand with a relapse to a theology that has more in common with Zwingli and Judaism than with Luther and the early Church" (p. 471).

In conclusion a few suggestions and criticisms may be in place. First the lack of an index is a defect that may be remedied in a future edition. A chapter on Hussitism and the modern Hussite liturgy would certainly have made the book more complete. There is a sentence on p. 116 which might be improved. Dr. Brilioth says: "The altar space in the later antique period was separated by a curtain, which in the Church of the East was afterwards represented by the iconostasis." The facts are that in the Armenian Church of the present day such a curtain is drawn for part of the service, and that in the Orthodox Church a curtain behind the door space may be used as well as the iconostasis. The use of the Thanksgiving as an alternative to the Prayer of Oblation in the English Prayer Book is not so rare as the author supposes. Finally, there is one conclusion which he himself does not draw from his own most valuable and suggestive investigations, but which will almost certainly be drawn by others. Western Christendom has been involved in interminable controversies, very largely because the balance of the different constituent "moments" in the Eucharist has been lost. Once lost, it is hard to recover. In the Orthodox East the controversies have not arisen to nearly the same extent, just because the balance has been better preserved. For this reason practical acquaintance with the present Orthodox use, not merely book knowledge of ancient liturgies, is absolutely indispensable for all who wish to improve the practice of the West. This is not to say that

the Orthodox use is absolutely ideal or capable of adaptation to Western conditions. But it is certain that without some familiarity with the Orthodox rite no one can properly understand or appreciate any Western rite.

Such a book as Dr. Brilioth's upon the Eucharist has a permanent value, and more especially at a time like the present, when liturgical revision is occupying so much attention, its appearance is particularly opportune.

The other book before us, the annual publication of the Church History Society, need not be discussed at such lengths. It has three considerable articles on the history of the Church Catechism in Sweden and two articles on medieval music. Till 1810 the most authoritative edition of the Church Catechism was that bearing the name of Archbishop Svebilius. After that date its place was taken by a revised edition bearing the name of Archbishop Lindblom. The work of revision was undertaken very carefully. And in the studies before us it is examined very minutely. Svebilius represented the older "orthodoxy." Lindbolm's revision, in which the work of several hands may be traced, aimed partly at stylistic improvement, the removal of archaisms and harsh or redundant expressions; but it was also, to a large extent, a manifesto of "neology," not entirely conscious, and tempered by fear of the censorship which affected even archbishops, and by the need of having regard to the conservatism of the king. Neology meant the optimistic ethical spirit of the enlightenment as opposed to the dogmatic and pessimistic outlook of orthodoxy. The neology of Lindblom made the book suspect in the pietistic circles of the Northern "Readers" nearly fifty years after its publication.

C. T. HARLEY WALKER.

BUCHAREST.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Vol. viii., No. 1.

E. L. Sukenik contributes an ingenious explanation of the difficult passage 2 Sam. v. 6-8: What is the meaning of צִנּוֹר *ṣinnor*? The Hebrew Lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs gives it as "pipe, spout, conduit." It is only found twice in the Old Testament: here, translated by Driver (*The Books of Samuel*, p. 260) "let him go up in (or by) *the water channel*," and Psalm xlii. 8 (English Version, 7), "at the voice of Thy *ṣinnors*," A.V. and R.V. "at the noise of thy waterspouts." E. L. Sukenik points out that the Targum of Onkelos translates the Hebrew מַזְלֵג, *mazleg* (Lex. "apparently a sacrificial implement, three-pronged fork") as *ṣinnorîtâ*. Modern Arabic has *ṣinnârah*, "a fish hook." The ancient form of the flesh hook was three-pronged like a trident. Here, then, in 2 Sam. v. we may have *ṣinnor* meaning some kind of weapon to be used in scaling the walls of Jerusalem, and in Psalm xlii. "the trident of God, with which he struck the sea and created the breakers."

Articles of archæological interest are contributed, amongst others, by G. M. Fitzgerald, lately Assistant Director of the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem, on Rhodian jar handles, and by Fr. M. Abel on the name Capernaum.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Theologische Blätter. June.

Professor C. Clemen discusses in an address given at the Conference of Evangelical Theologians at Eisenach last October the importance of the study of the history of comparative religion. Two points are emphasized, that all religions, even the prehistoric, should receive consideration, and that their mutual influence should be thoroughly examined. Such an examination will discover the importance which the origin of religious ideas and practices may have for our own theological position.

H. Preisker compares the early Christian and the Mandæan belief in redemption in various details, and concludes that primitive Christianity knew the existing forms of a Jewish-Oriental belief in redemption, as it was also taken over by the Mandæans, but deepened or transformed it under the influence of a historical personality and with the profound earnestness of its consciousness of sin.

Professor H. Rust raises the question whether a Protestant conception of the universe (*Weltanschauung*) is possible, in the same way as it is presented for the Catholic Church by Thomas Aquinas. Among other attempts to construct a Protestant conception of the universe, he points to the efforts made by the late Professor Paulsen and Professor Kaftan to represent Kant as the philosopher of Protestantism. He is convinced that there is not and cannot be a Protestant conception of the universe, but that this is not a loss but a gain to Protestantism.

L. P.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. April, 1928.

This number opens with a very interesting and scholarly article by Mgr. P. Batiffol on the use and meaning of the terms "Theologia" and "Theologi" in early Christian writers. These terms are not found in any writer before Justin, and Justin only uses the *verb* θεολογεῖν. He means by it "to declare to be God," "to give the predicate of God." In another passage it is used in a slightly sarcastic sense, "to introduce needless subtleties." Athenagoras uses both verb and substantive of pagans who theorise about their myths, but also referring to Christian doctrinal statements about God.

Turning to the Latin writers we find a similar meaning given to "Theologia" in Tertullian. He alludes to Varro's statement that there are *tria genera theologiæ*—namely, mythological, physical and political. In Tertullian *theologia* has not yet been adopted as a Christian word. Neither Cyprian nor Arnobius uses the word at all. Lactantius speaks of Euhemerus and Ennius as *theologi*. St. Augustine also accepts Varro's definition of *theologia* as *ratio quæ de dis explicatur*. But there is a kind of explanation of myths and cults given by such men as Varro and the Stoics which can be called *theologia naturalis*. As, however, it does not lead to the knowledge of God, it is rather a *physiologia* than a *theologia*—here we see an anticipation of the later Christian sense which was given to the word.

In the school of Alexandria Clement uses θεολογία in a good sense, "knowledge of things divine." To him, Orpheus, Musæus, Homer and so on are θεολόγοι who have learned from the Hebrew Prophets. He goes a long way to give the words Christian domicile. This is continued in Origen; in this writer "theology" is well on the way to mean "a doctrine of God worthy of Him." Origen also anticipates later Greek

and Byzantine piety in speaking of the Apostle John as "the Theologian." The verb *θεολογεῖν* is used in the sense of "speaking about God," or "attributing to God." Thus *ὁ θεολογούμενος* is the Being presented to us in Scripture as the True and Only God. By the time of Eusebius the Christian sense is so far established that he can speak of the "theology" of the pagans as "theology falsely so called."

Mgr. Batiffol's article is followed by a short dissertation on the references to St. Joseph in St. Ephræem Syrus, by Fr. Bover, a Spanish Jesuit. There are also two rather lengthy articles, by Benedictine writers, on points of Thomistic Theology—namely, St. Thomas's treatment of Contrition in relation to the Sacrament of Penance, and *appetitus naturalis*, the natural desire of the creature for the Creator.

As usual in this publication, very full reviews and lists of recently published thelogical works, in all languages, are given.

W. R. V. BRADE.

REVIEWS

THE GOSPEL FOR ASIA. By Kenneth Saunders, Litt.D. London: S.P.C.K. 1928. 10s. 6d. net.

It cannot be gainsaid that the S.P.C.K. has done English students of comparative religion a great service in making available for them Dr. Saunders' fascinating study of "Three Religious Masterpieces: Gita, Lotus, and Fourth Gospel." As those who have read M. Marcel-Oursel's pioneer book on Comparative Philosophy recognize therein a new chapter in the synthetic exposition of metaphysics, so those who take up this book will perceive a new and alluring essay in the synthesis of competing religions. Whether success or failure will ultimately attend such efforts in synthesis is open to question, but the pedagogical value of Dr. Saunders' book is immense. He gives a carefully illustrated exposition of the fundamental ideas and doctrines of the Gita, Lotus, and Fourth Gospel scriptures, employing an interesting though somewhat fanciful analogy between the structure of each of these and the characteristic forms of religious architecture, the Christian basilica, Buddhist chaitya and Hindu vimana. His conclusion is that the three religions and the three scriptures studied are less competitive with each other than complementary. The Christian Church must build as much upon the "noble foundations" of Hinduism and Buddhism as upon Judaism: the Kingdom languishes without their rich gifts. Christ is, says the author, "the crown and goal of Buddhism. And if of Buddhism then of Hinduism."

It is a familiar and an attractive theme, not without its pedagogical truth, but we could wish that Dr. Saunders had more plainly faced some vital issues of which he is fully aware, but which he rarely forces to a decision. Are Jesus, the Blessed One, and Krishna to be regarded as exchangeable terms, signifying exchangeable and equivaluable realities? Dr. Saunders admits in various places (pp. 29, 31, 173, and elsewhere) that "India has to choose which Lord she will follow," but he conveys the impression that eventually she may not unjustifiably follow all three, since the aim of all these scriptures is to "relate the Beloved One to Cosmic Truth." "Your Christ," he quotes the thoughtful Buddhist as saying, "is a manifestation of the Dharma; in our Buddha the Logos was revealed," and he thinks that "the Christian may welcome this as a reconciling statement."

Dr. Saunders will have nothing to do with apocalyptic elements in Christianity. He is convinced that in the Fourth Gospel there is almost nothing apocalyptic, that it is nearer

to the historic facts than are the synoptics, and that those who emphasize or seek to return to the apocalyptic are misguided indeed. For a consistent portrait of the historic Jesus "we shall have to get rid of the apocalyptic element almost completely," and he quotes with approval Schweitzer's saying that "it is not Jesus as historically known but as spiritually arisen within men who is significant for our time." In disavowing the apocalyptic element Dr. Saunders allows himself to say that "the Synoptists were men imbued with an apocalypticism which we may, or rather must reject," and then writes the following sentence, which we find unintelligible: "The flight of time has revealed it as an illusion; and it has no less clearly proved that Jesus was between a view of God as infinite patience and love, and a mighty and consistent thinker who did not alternate contrary view of Him as an Oriental despot about to destroy a world He could not recreate" (p. 40).

It might be supposed that the gospel for Asia would contain as a central feature the breaking of bread, the Lord's Supper at the Lord's command, but Dr. Saunders' references to the Eucharist are meagre and unsatisfying. One would not learn from him that it is the Fourth Gospel itself which contains the great discourses on the Bread of Life. Are these hard sayings too hard to be included in the gospel for Asia? In Chapter V. he discusses "the architecture and analysis" of his three books: the prologue to the Fourth Gospel is "a noble porch of mingled Greek and Hebrew form, with its great threefold doorway." From this, we learn, we pass into what may be called the Holy Place of the Temple (John xiii.-xvii.), and there, says our author, we find "the Christ alone with his disciples . . . in the great sacrament of service, which the Church of our time accepts as equally binding with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Is this not an easily misunderstood and misleading sentence? It is one of many instances in which Dr. Saunders essays to "set free the Christ from the local and the accidental."

But although we must hesitate in accepting a philosophy too eclectic and a theology too dubious, yet of the high pedagogic value of this book there can be no doubt. It will attract many readers, and deservedly so. It will do much to kindle a sympathy between thoughtful Christians and thoughtful Buddhists and Hindus, and we may well be grateful for Dr. Saunders' generous attempt at an eirenicon between the world's two greatest religions.

In the next edition a number of misprints should be corrected on pp. 57, 86, 111, 122, 145; the word "parrel" and the sentence from p.40 already quoted both seem unintelligible to the present reviewer.

ALBERT A. COCK.

NOTICES

THE CASE FOR CHRISTIANITY. By Clement F. Rogers. An outline of popular apologetics. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 12s. 6d.

This book is divided into two parts. In the first Professor Rogers deals with the approach to the question "Is Christianity true?" Very rightly he begins from the practical side, and presents the Christian ideal as an appeal to conscience. He then examines popular objections to the faith, a subject with which probably no living writer is better qualified to deal. In the second part we have the ordinary arguments for Christian Theism restated in a somewhat original and certainly attractive style.

Throughout, the treatment, as implied in the sub-title, is popular in the sense that it assumes little or no previous acquaintance with the subject-matter. But the author displays a very wide knowledge of recent discussion sand copious references are given, very conveniently arranged in footnotes. Possibly one might desiderate a somewhat more judicial attitude, a little more careful balancing of the evidence, in regard to certain points. He gives the impression, at these points, of a certain one-sidedness. For example, one might refer to the treatment of the Fourth Gospel, without rejecting the value, here insisted upon, of Bishop Westcott's well-known defence of the Johannine authorship. The argument against teleology, based on what we believe to be a mistaken view of natural selection, ought to have been stated and examined. We are surprised to find no mention, just where we should have expected it, of Professor Lloyd Morgan's theory of emergent evolution. This strikes us as a somewhat serious omission. There are some minor details which invite criticism, as for example in the chronology of St. Paul's life. On p. 76 it seems to be implied that the Apostle was put to death in A.D. 63. And the year 58 is too late for the writing of 1 Corinthians. The treatment of the atonement, on the positive side, is rather superficial.

In matters of typography, the accentuation of Greek words is occasionally deplorable.

But these are only blemishes in a work of real excellence. Features of outstanding merit are Professor Rogers' treatment of the relation of the mystery religions to Christianity, and of the rival views, Liberal Protestant, "religious historical," apocalyptic, of the Person of our Lord, and, above all, his masterly refutation of the charge of obscurantism often brought against the Church. He conclusively proves the truth of the sentence which he quotes from Professor Gwatkin: "modern science is the nursling of Christianity."

J. H. BEIBITZ.

WHY MR. BERTRAND RUSSELL IS NOT A CHRISTIAN. An Essay on Controversy. By H. G. Wood, M.A. London: S.C.M. 4s.

The title of this book suggests that it is an answer to Mr. Bertrand Russell's little tract containing the report of a lecture he gave to a local branch of the Secular Society in Battersea. In it he showed a thorough understanding of his audience and gave them what can be heard any Sunday in Hyde Park from men of less education. I suppose the authori-

ties of the Student Christian Movement know what students read and need; otherwise one would have thought the lecture was hardly worth answering. Mr. Wood has no difficulty in showing that it was superficial, ignorant, and unfair. In one way, indeed, it was a severe indictment of the Church; it showed how entirely unable she has been to make a learned and sincere man think it worth while to find out what Christianity really is.

But there is another Mr. Russell, a philosopher who always commands our respect and often our admiration. That he is not a Christian may make the student doubt, and perhaps give undue weight to his less reasoned objections. He may think it difficult to believe that a man accustomed to weigh his words can really have descended to such cheap methods of controversy. So Mr. Wood has gone on to give a serious criticism of the present phase of his philosophy. This part of the book will be appreciated by those who have had some philosophical training, while the ordinary reader will at least feel reassured on finding that there is some answer to be given.

But there is a third Mr. Russell more dangerous than either the popular controversialist and the serious thinker, and that is the Mr. Russell who disbelieves in and attacks the Christian ideal of chastity, denying that it is either practicable or desirable, and the author before his "last word" adds a chapter on Mr. Russell and the ethics of sex. Many people would say that this is a question a man must settle before he is qualified to discuss apologetics or to argue on philosophy.

What this book, therefore, may lose in point it gains in thoroughness. It might have merely shown the blatancy of popular secularist methods. It might have argued on philosophy alone. It might have refused to consider any but the moral issue. Instead it has supplied the material from which the student can give some answer to attacks on the Faith from whichever quarter they come.

C. F. ROGERS.

GOD AND HIS WORKS: BEING SELECTIONS FROM PART I. OF THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Arranged with an Introduction by A. G. Hebert. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This interesting little work well sustains the reputation of the useful series "Texts for Students," of which it is the fortieth number.

The quotations from St. Thomas, which are given in the original Latin, are well chosen; and students who work through them are likely to desire to study the Summa *in extenso*. Fr. Hebert contributes a thoughtful introduction dealing with the relation between Aristotelianism and Platonism, and the Angelic Doctor's relation to both.

We heartily commend this booklet.

CHARLES HARRIS.

THE STRUCTURE AND MESSAGE OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By Vacher Burch, D.D. Martin Hopkinson. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Burch's methods of criticism are an extraordinary mixture of extreme Conservatism and unbalanced Liberalism. He sharply challenges the consensus of modern critical opinion, that the provenance of the Fourth Gospel is Ephesian, its date towards the close of the first century, its object

to commend the Christian message to the educated Gentile world, and that its report of our Lord's discourses contains a considerable "interpretative" element. Dr. Burch would have us believe, not only that this Gospel is the work of the Son of Zebedee (in this he still has the support of weighty authorities), but also that it is earlier than the Fall of Jerusalem. Indeed, he would have us regard it not only as pre-synoptic, but apparently even as pre-Pauline, for he assigns its composition to a date shortly after the Crucifixion. "The contents and structure of the original text of John . . . . ask that its date be put near the time of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ" (p. 228).

Following Burney, Dr. Burch contends that St. John wrote the Gospel in Aramaic, and that it was translated into Greek towards the close of the first century by an unknown "Johannist," who modelled his style upon the First Epistle of John. The prologue, he considers, was the work of John himself, and formed part of the Gospel from the first. The original Aramaic work terminated with the incident of the effusion of blood and water from the pierced side of our Lord, St. John's concluding words being: "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe" (xix. 35).

In Dr. Burch's opinion, the translator's rendering of St. John's Aramaic is extraordinarily faithful—we can trust it completely. He made, however, certain considerable additions to the Gospel, inserted sundry notes, and made a few transpositions. If we excise the additions and notes, and restore the dislocated passages to their original position, we have the Gospel practically as the Apostle wrote it. St. John's Gospel was written while the Lord's words were still fresh in his mind; he reproduced them with fidelity: consequently, we have in the dominical teaching which he records, if not the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus (which of course were spoken in Aramaic), at any rate as near an approximation to them as is to be found in Q or in Mark. On the whole, Dr. Burch considers that the Johannine discourses represent our Lord's teaching more accurately than the Synoptics, because whereas John was an actual eye-witness, "Matthew," Mark, and Luke had to depend upon the reports of others. The teaching of Jesus in St. John contains no Christology, and no developed theology. Jesus speaks of Himself simply as "the Revealer" of God, not as His Son in the later metaphysical sense. There is no anticipation in this Gospel of the Catholic or even the Pauline Christology and Soteriology. True, Jesus claimed for Himself, both in Galilee and Jerusalem, such exalted titles as Memra, Sophia, Man (Son of Man), Messiah, Bread of Life, Arm (or Hand) of God, the Just One, Lord, Doer, Servant, Power (Dynamis), Life, Light, Only-Begotten, Priest, Shepherd, Saviour, Spirit, Vine, Truth, Way, and even Logos (which is derived, not from Greek philosophy, but from the *Wisdom of Solomon*); but all these terms, as used by Him, simply indicated that He was the unique "Revealer" of God, not that He stood in any special "metaphysical" relation to Him. There is no Christology in the Fourth Gospel.

Dr. Burch may be right in his view that Jesus spoke of Himself in the Johannine way, but, *if He did*, then quite clearly He taught a very definite Christology. For example, the saying "Before Abraham was (γενέσθαι), I am (εἰμί)," which Dr. Burch accepts as authentic, can hardly mean less than that He claimed to share in the eternal manner of being characteristic of God (Exod. iii. 14). Moreover the preface, which Dr. Burch assigns to the Apostle, so far from interpreting the Logos as merely "the

Revealer," represents Him as divine (John i. 2), and as the agent in creation (i. 2), which involves both a Christology and a cosmology.

Dr. Burch cannot have it both ways. Either he must reject the Johannine discourses as unauthentic, or else he must admit that Jesus Himself held a view of His Person which can hardly be distinguished from that which finds expression in the Pauline Epistles, and was afterwards formulated in the Catholic Creeds.

To turn to subsidiary, yet not unimportant matters, Dr. Burch's conviction that our Lord's teaching was anti-ecclesiastical, hostile to all ceremonial worship, and anti-sacramental, leads him to excise the very obvious reference to baptismal regeneration in iii. 5, the statement that our Lord's disciples administered baptism (iv. 1-2), and the entire section which speaks of eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood (vi. 51*b*-57), in which he correctly sees a reference to the Eucharist. Similarly he refuses to recognize in our Lord's breathing upon the Apostles and imparting to them the Holy Spirit (xx. 22) any reference to ordination. It is simply, he thinks, an example of the Roman custom of the nearest friend receiving into his mouth the last breath of a dying person. "Jesus is about to pass away from the earth, and He is depicted as allowing His disciples to catch His last breath. The writer has put, as it were, a toga on the shoulders of Jesus" (p. 171). It would be hard to find a parallel to the downright perversity of this *tour de force*.

The great High-Priestly Prayer (17) is treated as an interpolation—the work not of John but his "Johannist" translator. It cannot be genuine, because it implies a metaphysic of Christ's person—a veritable Christology (vv. 5, 24)—as indeed it does. Originally it formed part of an Ascension narrative, which placed it in the mouth of Jesus just before His Ascension. The translator of the Fourth Gospel originally placed it after John xx. 23. It was subsequently moved to its present unsatisfactory position, where it forms a kind of epilogue to the discourses at the Last Supper.

It hardly seems necessary to criticize so arbitrary a view. This prayer is usually acknowledged to be the work of a great religious genius; it is in the same style as the Gospel; and to seek its author in a nameless translator or redactor violates every canon of sound criticism.

Not less arbitrary is the writer's treatment of the close of the Second Gospel. He regards *the whole* of Mark xvi. (not simply the last twelve verses) as unauthentic. The lost ending of Mark, however, was known to the translator of St. John's Aramaic Gospel, or perhaps to some early scribe, who "noticed that John lacked all the Resurrection matter, and transferred the closing papyri leaves of Mark to John" (p. 179). Dr. Burch's conclusion is that we possess in John xx. and xxi. the lost ending of Mark, which "closed with the simple and majestic command of Jesus, 'Follow me'" (see John xxi. 22). Why, if this lost ending survived to the close of the first century, it was unknown to (or at any rate unused by) Matthew and Luke; and why, under such circumstances, it has not survived in any MS. or version; why, also, it shows so little affinity with the style of Mark, are difficulties which have not occurred to Dr. Burch—at any rate, he does not discuss them.

We have commented upon the position taken up in this book more fully than we otherwise should, because the author fills the responsible post of Lecturer in Theology, Liverpool Cathedral and Cathedral School of Divinity. For this post he certainly possesses the qualification

of learning. His wide reading enables him often to illustrate his statements from unusual and recondite sources. As a whole, however, his book is disappointing. The style is heavy, obscure, unidiomatic, and sometimes un-English. Confident assertions many times repeated do duty for argument. It is not too much to say that the work is a striking illustration of the truth that a man may have much learning, without being either a good critic or a good historian.

CHARLES HARRIS.

PALLADII DIALOGUS DE VITA S. JOANNIS CHRYSOSTOMI. Edited by P. R. Coleman-Norton, A.M., D.Phil. Cambridge University Press. 15s. net.

The first of the studies collected in honour of the saint's fifteenth centenary twenty years ago was entitled "La figura morale di san Giovanni Crisostomo," and it is probably from that aspect that he makes his most attractive and enduring appeal. Its author, Professor Turchi, spoke of the "dialogo retorico di Palladio vescovo di Eliopoli," and in the second study Abbot Butler of Downside discussed the "Authorship of the Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi." His conclusion was that, after making all necessary allowance for the fact that we are so largely dependent on internal evidence, Palladius of Helenopolis is to be accepted as the author. In other words, the "Dialogue" is from the same hand as the "Lausiac History" which Abbot Butler edited for the Cambridge "Texts and Studies" and which has been made available for English students in a very useful little volume of the S.P.C.K. translation series by Dr. Lowther Clarke. Unlike the "History," however, the "Dialogue" still awaited a competent modern editor who would prepare a text based on a new comparison of manuscripts and freed from editorial embellishments, and would supply critical apparatus, notes, a worthy introduction, and the indexes of words and biblical quotations which to the great advantage of students have once more become customary. All these requirements have been admirably fulfilled by Dr. Coleman-Norton in the present volume, which is a dissertation for the Oxford D.Phil.

The passages for comparison adduced by Abbot Butler were sufficiently close to make the conclusion highly probable. The present editor has enlarged them and has added not only an extensive survey of the views of previous students, but also a critical examination of the supposed difficulties, some of them by no means easy to handle. It is true that the value of the Dialogue does not depend on the identification, for no one who reads it is likely to admit that the study of Chrysostom that it contains is a mere product of imagination. The writer had seen him, as Professor Coleman-Norton says, "in the various phases of his work as teacher and administrator, instructing the people or the clergy, or managing the funds of the Church, or caring for the poor and the widows. He had seen him faithful in his secular responsibilities, yet escaping them whenever possible and eagerly turning his attention to spiritual matters. He knew his habits of food and had shared in his strict monastic asceticism. And though many of these features might be regarded as "common form," there is just the touch which gives individuality. The editor is at times perhaps a little hard in his judgment of the style of Palladius, but he has rendered both to him and to modern students a very real service.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

A Selection of

CAMBRIDGE BOOKS

THE BOOK OF THE SAINTS OF THE ETHIOPIAN CHURCH

A translation of the Ethiopic Synaxarium (Maṣḥafa Sĕnkĕsâr) made from the manuscripts Oriental 660 and 661 in the British Museum, with an introduction, by Sir E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, Kt, M.A., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.S.A.

In 4 volumes. Demy 8vo. Price £3 3s net.

This is the first complete translation of the Ethiopic Synaxarium that has appeared in any language. It gives the lives not only of the saints and martyrs of the Jacobite Church of Egypt but also of many ascetics, monks, and anchorites of later centuries, and throws light on early Christian folklore, on the relations between the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, and Constantinople, and on the heresies which appeared in the Church in its early years. 300 copies only of this work have been printed, of which 250 are for sale.

3 ENOCH, or The Hebrew Book of Enoch

Edited and translated for the first time, with an introduction, a commentary, and critical notes, by HUGO ODEBERG, Ph.D.(Lond.). Royal 8vo. 42s net.

The complete Hebrew Book of Enoch has never been printed before. The present edition is based on a Bodleian MS., entitled "Book of Enoch, by R. Ishmael ben Elisha, High Priest."

"A valuable addition to the library and a mine of information to the scholar."

The Birmingham Post.

PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY

Volume I. The Soul and its Faculties. By F. R. TENNANT, D.D., B.Sc.
Royal 8vo. 21s net.

The study of Philosophical Theology or of those tracts of philosophy which have a bearing on the cognitive basis of religion requires some initial knowledge of psychology, natural sciences, and metaphysics. At the outset of his studies the student is not in a position to know what portions of these vast fields are essential to him; and in this work Dr Tennant aims at doing the selective work for him and providing him with the necessary initial knowledge of these cognate studies.

PALLADII DIALOGUS DE VITA S. JOANNIS CHRYSOSTOMI

Edited, with a revised text, an introduction, notes, indices, and appendices, by P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON, A.M. (Prin.), D.Phil. (Oxon). Demy 8vo. 15s net.

The *Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi*, written *c.* 408 by Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis, is the best authority for the life of S. Chrysostom, especially for the period during which he was Archbishop of Constantinople. The Greek text has now been fully edited by Dr. Coleman-Norton, Assistant Professor of Classics in Princeton University.

OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS

By R. H. KENNETT. Demy 8vo. 12s 6d net.

These essays by the Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge deal with the following subjects: The early narratives of the Jahvistic document of the Pentateuch; Ezekiel; The Jewish priesthood; The Altar Fire; The Day of Atonement; The Historical background of the Psalms; The origin and development of the Messianic Hope.

THE REAL PRESENCE
Or The Localisation in Cultus of the Divine Presence

By A. C. BOUQUET, D.D. Crown 8vo. 4s net.

The author's main object is to lay before the educated Christian public the facts about localisation, and to enable them to decide for themselves without prejudice the proper place which sacramental ordinances should occupy in the religious life.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4

New S.P.C.K. Books

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES.

By Rose Graham. With illustrations. 15s. net. [*Ready in October.*

Miss Graham's studies of Medieval life, largely concerned with Monasticism, represent the research of many years. The essays, which have appeared in various magazines, are now collected in permanent form. Among them are:

THE RELATION OF CLUNY TO SOME OTHER MOVEMENTS OF MONASTIC REFORM.
THE ENGLISH PROVINCE OF THE ORDER OF CLUNY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.
THE PRIORY OF LA CHARITÉ-SUR-LOIRE AND THE MONASTERY OF BERMONDSEY.
THE TAXATION OF POPE NICHOLAS IV.

A MANUAL GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

By H. E. Dana, Th.D., and Julius R. Mantey, Th.D., D.D.
12s. 6d. net.

The distinctive value of this work lies in the simplicity and clarity with which it presents the vital principles of Greek grammar. Each point is fully elucidated and illustrated by vivid examples from the New Testament. While it is a compendium of all the essential points of Greek New Testament grammar, it is at the same time a handbook pre-eminently adapted to all the needs of the average student. It is equipped with paradigms, the principal parts of irregular verbs, and an English-Greek vocabulary. The authors are thoroughly abreast with the latest researches and discoveries in Koiné Greek.

THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM, LOVE AND POWER.

Instructions and Material for Meditation. By Paul B. Bull, C.R. Paper cover, 1s. 6d. Duxeen boards, 2s. 6d. net.

A theological book on rather novel lines, combining instruction with devotion. Most books on the Holy Spirit are either dry theological treatises, or else purely devotional works. Father Bull provides for those who wish their theology to be infused with a spirit of practical devotion, as also for those who prefer their meditations to be based on a solid intellectual foundation.

CYPRIAN DE UNITATE ECCLESIÆ.

The Latin text, translated, with an Introduction and Brief Notes, by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (Texts for Students, No. 43.) Paper cover, 1s. 6d. Cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

THE BOOK OF RUTH.

The Hebrew Text, with Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary, by A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D. (Texts for Students, No. 43.) 2s. 6d. net.

A companion volume to the "Book of Amos," edited on the same lines by Dr. T. H. Robinson, which has been found most useful.

A TAOIST PEARL.

By A. P. Quentin. Illustrated. 4s. 6d. net.

A simple and affecting story of Father Siao, a Taoist priest, who by study of the New Testament, and with the help of the Author, an evangelical Missionary, was converted to Christianity. The book is written in a spirit of living faith which is most attractive, and introduces the reader very happily to the difficult subject of Taoism. The Taoist designs used to illustrate the book are novel and especially interesting.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2

And of all Booksellers. *Lists post free.*

New S.P.C.K. Books

THE GOSPEL FOR ASIA.
A Study of Three Religious Masterpieces: Gita, Lotus, and Fourth Gospel.
By KENNETH SAUNDERS, LITT.D. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

EDMUND RICH, Archbishop and Saint.
By M. R. NEWBOLT. With several illustrations. Cloth boards. 5s. net

S. FRANÇOIS DE SALES, 1567–1622.
By E. K. SANDERS. Cloth boards. 12s. net.

ENGLISH PREACHERS AND PREACHING, 1640–1670. A Secular Study.
By CAROLINE FRANCIS RICHARDSON. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.
By C. C. J. WEBB, M.A., F.B.A., Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the University of Oxford. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

THE DIARY OF JOHN YOUNG, S.T.P., Dean of Winchester, 1616 to the Commonwealth.
Extracts transcribed and edited by FLORENCE REMINGTON GOODMAN. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

THE SUFFERING OF THE IMPASSIBLE GOD.
By BERTRAND R. BRASNETT, M.A., B.D. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

EUSEBIUS, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA.
The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine.
Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by HUGH JACKSON LAWLOR, D.D., LITT.D., Dean of St. Patrick's and Beresford Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and JOHN ERNEST LEONARD OULTON, B.D., Lecturer on the Bible in the University of Dublin. Vol. II. Introduction, Notes and Index. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

THE TEACHING CHURCH.
A Handbook of Adult Religious Education.
By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER, and others. Edited by A. L. WOODARD. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. Cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH SINCE THE REVOLUTION.
By G. P. FEDOTOFF. Duxeen boards. 2s. 6d. net.

CREATIVE PERSONALITY AND EVOLUTION.
Sermons by STEWART A. MCDOWALL, B.D., Chaplain of Winchester College. Cloth boards. 5s. net.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
LONDON: Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2
And of all Booksellers. *Lists post free.*

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

A One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause, will be published this year.

The Second Edition of "The Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice" (S.P.C.K., 2d.) is now ready.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be oppressed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership: Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows: Full Members, 10/- a year; Associates, 2/6; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 *per annum, post free.*

ARNOLD PINCHARD,
Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.

Facing first page of matter